

THE

Churchman's Magazine.

VOL. V.] SEPTEMBER & OCTOBER, 1808. [No. 7.

BIOGRAPHY.

*The Life of the Most Reverend JOHN POTTER, D. D. Lord
Archbishop of Canterbury.*

THE father of this learned divine, and vigilant prelate, was a linen draper at Wakefield, in Yorkshire, where the son was born in 1674, and received his education at the grammar school till he came to the age of fourteen, when he was removed to Oxford, and entered a batteler of University College. In 1693 he published, in one volume octavo, "*Variantes Lectiones et Notæ ad Plutarchi librum de audiendis Poëtis, cum Interpretatione Latina Hugonis Grotii; item Variantes Lectiones et Notæ ad Basilii Magni Orationem ad Juvenes quomodo cum fructu legere possint Græcorum libros.*" This work was printed at the University press, and the expense was defrayed by Dr. Arthur Charlett, master of University College, who presented copies of it as a new year's gift to the young students of his house. The year following Mr. Potter was chosen fellow of Lincoln College, where he became a distinguished tutor. In 1697 he published a beautiful edition of Lycophron's *Alexandra*, in folio, and the same year appeared the first volume of his *Archæologie Græcæ*, or the *Antiquities of Greece*, which was followed by the second volume the next year. These works established his fame in the learned world, and procured him an extensive correspondence with men of letters at home and abroad. In 1704 he took the degree of bachelor in divinity, and was appointed chaplain to Archbishop Tenison. He proceeded to his doctor's degree in 1706, and soon after became chaplain in ordinary to Queen Anne. The next year he published his valuable "*Discourse on Church Government*," in which he thoroughly refuted the pernicious principles of Erastianism, then beginning to be fashionable; and vindicated Episcopacy by in-

controvertible arguments. This excellent performance has been well abridged, in a small compass, by the late worthy Mr. William Stevens. At the beginning of the next year, he succeeded Dr. Jane, as Regius professor of divinity, and canon of Christ Church, in Oxford, for which he was indebted to the special interposition of the great Duke of Marlborough. By the same interest also, Dr. Potter was raised to the bishopric of Oxford in 1715, in which year appeared his edition of Clemens Alexandrinus. While he was engaged in printing this work, a humour fell into his eyes, which obliged him to commit the care of correcting the press to others: whence it unfortunately happened that numerous typographical errors abound in it, of which he makes a heavy complaint in his preface. He still held the professorship, and filled both dignities with the greatest reputation, rarely failing to preside in person at the divinity disputations in the schools; and regularly holding his triennial visitation at St. Mary's church, upon which occasion, his charges to the Clergy were always suited to the exigency of the times. Accordingly, when Hoadley advanced his doctrine aboutincerity as the only ground of acceptance with God, Bishop Potter took occasion, in his first charge, in 1718, to caution his Clergy against it. This charge being printed at the request of the audience, was warmly resented by Hoadley; and though neither his name nor the title of his book occurred therein, he took the rebuke to himself, and presently published an answer, to which our author replied. Bishop Potter entered into this controversy with a more fervent zeal than was thought natural to the coolness and moderation of his temper, for which he alleged, that the very existence of the church being struck at by the doctrines he opposed, it became an indispensable duty upon the pastors thereof to defend it. To this purpose he very appositely quoted that law at Athens, which in case of any dangerous commotions and disturbances in the state, excused those who had espoused the party in opposition to that which finally prevailed, as having engaged therein honestly, though with a mistaken zeal; whilst a severe penalty was inflicted upon those who contented themselves quietly under their vines at home without engaging on either side; which indifference or neutrality was condemned as proceeding from a resolution to risk nothing for the public good. It is remarkable, that Hoadley, in his answer, declares he was

more concerned on account of this adversary than any other; and no doubt he had more to apprehend from Bishop Potter's character at that time, than that of all his other antagonists put together.

Some time after this controversy, our prelate obtained the particular friendship of the Princess of Wales, afterwards queen Caroline, and, upon the accession of George II. to the throne, he preached the coronation sermon, which was printed: and the chief direction of the public affairs, with regard to the church, was tendered to him, but he declined the offer, thinking it would involve him too much in state affairs. He then retired to discharge the duties of his bishopric and professorship; and there continued till, by the death of Archbishop Wake, in 1736, he was called to the metropolitan chair. This high station he filled during the space of ten years with great reputation; wholly attentive to the duties of his ecclesiastical function, without engaging too highly in the secular affairs incident to that great office. Thus employed, he fell into a lingering disorder, which put a period to his life in 1747, leaving behind him the character of a prelate of distinguished piety and learning, strictly orthodox with regard to the doctrines of the Church of England, and a zealous and vigilant guardian thereof, against all the attempts that were made to subvert and undermine the establishment during his presidency. This brought upon him the illiberal censures of that weak and conceited old man William Whiston, who, in the memoirs of his own life, tells a foolish tale respecting his recommending Dr. Potter to Queen Caroline for the Archbishopric of Canterbury, though the fact is indisputable that the bishop was in the confidence and favour of the princess long before she came to the throne. The concluding remark of Whiston respecting this great prelate is very curious. "I am sorry, very sorry to say it, that Archbishop Potter seemed to me almost as unwilling to open his eyes to see the grievous errors of Athanasianism, which are now so fully detected as to be sinking out of the learned world, as any of the Papists were to see the other gross errors of Popery at the Protestant reformation." Here we see that the ground of Whiston's enmity to the Archbishop was the firmness of the latter in maintaining the orthodox faith, of which the former was through life the furious but weak assailant.

Another person who bore the Archbishop no good-will, was Dr. Conyers Middleton, who ascribed the loss of the mastership of the Charter-House to the Prelate's interference. The Archbishop more than suspected that Middleton was a deist, and on that account he conscientiously opposed his appointment to that station. Middleton's rival was Mr. Mann, author of a "Harmony of the Gospels," and "Critical Notes on particular passages of Scripture." He was a person of considerable learning, but not very sound in his theological principles; and when he waited upon the Archbishop to thank him for his vote, he had the impertinence to say, "I suppose your grace knows that you have made choice of an *Arrian*." The Archbishop was startled, but soon recollecting himself, made answer, "An *Arrian* perhaps may be better than a *Deist*."

In 1753 was published, in three volumes octavo, "The Theological Works of Dr. John Potter, late Archbishop of Canterbury, containing his Sermons, Charges, and Discourse of Church Government and Divinity Lectures;" a collection which ought to be in every Clergyman's library.

For the Churchman's Magazine.

(From a Correspondent.)

NAAMAN THE SYRIAN.

Observations on the fifth Chapter of the second Book of Kings.

NAAMAN, it seems, was a personage of high distinction, a mighty man of valour, by whom deliverance had been given unto Syria; and, therefore, we are informed, "he was a great man with his master, and honourable." But, as there is always some drop of bitterness in the sweetest cup of human felicity, some infirmity blended with the most exalted character, some alloy of misery in the most brilliant and honourable situations, we find that this great and distinguished favourite did not escape the common lot of mortality—his enjoyments were all embittered by the prevalence of a loathsome and lingering disease, "for he was a leper." His master, the king of Syria,

could give him wealth, or raise him to honour—these might be *conferred* by the hand of mortal man, but the ability to *enjoy* them must come from a superior power.

Every circumstance of human life, however trifling it may at first appear, may be fraught with important consequences; and every person, however low and insignificant we may deem him, may have it in his power to do us much good, as well as to inflict many grievous injuries. And this consideration ought to excite in us a spirit of universal gentleness and condescension. To recover the noble Syrian, every remedy had undoubtedly been applied, which the greatest wealth, or the highest influence could procure; but hitherto without success. The first prospect of relief appeared, it is probable, from a very unexpected quarter. To the intervention of a little maid, who had been carried away captive out of the land of Israel, and who waited on Naaman's wife, the recovery of that great man from his dreadful malady was to be attributed: "For she said unto her mistress, would God, my Lord were with the Prophet that is in Samaria, for he would recover him of his leprosy."

He that has much to *give*, always finds the rest of the world very ready to serve him. The inquiry is, not whether he is *worthy* of their services, but whether he is able to *reward* them. We have reason to observe with regret, that the man who moves in the inferior ranks of life is too often a creature of little consequence to the greater part of those who are near him: others are seldom much affected either by his pleasures, or his pains. But elevate this man with riches; surround him with the splendors of power; and he becomes, at once, the object of universal attention. Has he a wish? All fly to gratify it. Has he a pain? All strive who shall be the first to mitigate it. No sooner was a mode proposed for the recovery of the favourite courtier, than one immediately went in and told his lord, "Thus and thus said the maid that is of the land of Israel."

The king of Syria appears to have entertained a proper sense of the advantages which he had derived from the exertions of his valiant servant; he, therefore, embraces the proposal without hesitation, and with an earnestness of expression that commonly indicates sincerity, replies at once, "Go to, go, and I will send a letter unto the king of Israel." *This* was accordingly written; and the purport of it was, "I have herewith sent

Naaman my servant to thee, that thou mayest recover him of his leprosy." But why did he not write to the prophet himself? Did he suppose that all wisdom and all virtue must necessarily be connected with earthly pomp and power? Did he not know, that God seeth not as man seeth; that, to confound the vanity of the human heart, and to show how the most unpromising instruments may be made, in *his* hands, effectual for the most astonishing purposes, he frequently passes the rich and the powerful; and selects, from among the lowly and upright, persons to be invested even with divine qualifications—with the *gift of prophecy*, and the *power of working miracles*? The truth of these assertions the king of Israel was not now to learn; he knew how far his powers extended, and where they were necessarily limited.

It has frequently been remarked with propriety, that happiness is more equally distributed among the various ranks of men, than the world commonly imagines. If wealth and power be possessed of many peculiar advantages; they are also assailed by numberless distracting pangs which never agitate the breasts of the lowly. The cedar of the mountain, from its very situation, is exposed to the rending tempest, from which the shrub of the valley is entirely sheltered. He that *aspires* to greatness may be said to live in *solicitude*, but he that *possesses* it certainly lives in *peace*. His suspicions are continually alarmed; he trembles at every blast, as if it were directly intended to overthrow the fabric which he has erected; his eye is ever pained with the appearance of some supposed enemy; his ear is always open to the sound of some approaching danger. No sooner had the king of Israel read the letter, than his jealous fears were all awakened. He attributes it not to curiosity, or friendship, or respect. *They*, whose situation leads them to use much art themselves, seldom expect candour in the conduct of others. Suspicion, ever ingenious in inventing causes of torment, immediately whispers, "this extraordinary application must certainly arise from some sinister motive—some intended mischief undoubtedly lurks under these fair appearances." Agitated with these extravagant apprehensions, "he rent his clothes and said, Am I God, to kill and to make alive, that this man doth send unto me to recover a man of his leprosy? Wherefore consider, I pray you, and see how he

seeketh a quarrel against me." How very different from these are the prevailing sentiments of the young and artless? Happy, enviable state! when the heart is not rendered cold and suspicious by long experience of the wickedness of men; when every emotion of the soul darts undisguised from the eye, and plays on the countenance; when every generous expression of esteem from others is received with an open bosom, and returned with reciprocal ardor! Long may such ingenuous dispositions escape the blasts of a selfish and malignant world, which, wherever they go, kill at once all these sweetest flowers of paradise.

Let sinful greatness tremble, and guard its dear acquisitions with never-ceasing anxiety; the man of steadfast integrity and humble piety is far removed from such vain alarms. Not seduced by the smiles of an earthly superior into excessive joy, nor over-awed by his frowns into abject fear; not much afraid of what man can do unto him, while he retains the loving-kindness of *him* who rules over all; he stands collected in himself, ready to turn every occurrence to the glory of God, and the good of mankind: "Let him come now to *me*, says the good Elisha, "and he shall know that there is a prophet in Israel."

Those who have been long accustomed to luxurious living, splendid equipage, and all the delicate accommodations which elevated rank and fortune can procure, find it difficult, even on the most solemn occasions, to lay aside the haughty superior, and assume the mild deportment of the humble supplicant. They find the world, in general, bowing down before them; their intercourse with mankind has too often been in the style of peremptory command, and not of gentle entreaty. When, therefore, driven to the painful necessity, they will solicit a favour from *men*, with an air of superiority; and even blend, with their devotions to *heaven*, a needless parade; as if a display of external decoration could render them, in the sight of God, objects of more particular regard. "Naaman came with his retinue, with his horses, and with his chariot, and stood at the door of the house of Elisha; thinking, as it would seem, to awaken in the prophet, by this splendid appearance, some marks of extreme solicitude; some extraordinary preparations to effect his cure. But the good prophet was little moved by the world, and its glittering vanities. His life was devoted to

moderation in all things, and, for the most part, spent in retirement. The influence of the great favourite of the king of Syria extended not to his humble habitation. He had no interest to serve, but the interest of truth and virtue; he had no advancement in view, but the advancement of God's glory among the children of men. He therefore simply "sent a messenger unto him, saying, Go and wash in Jordan seven times, and thy flesh shall come again unto thee, and thou shalt be clean." And here, we have reason to lament the dangers of that state, where every passion is apt to be flattered, and every appetite strengthened by long and unrestrained indulgence. The man who is placed in these circumstances becomes capacious and perverse; provoked by the slightest opposition; disinclined, on every occasion, to relinquish his own pretensions, or to go out of his own way, and sometimes, even contemptuously rejecting a *favour*, if it may not be conferred on his own terms. "Thus, Naaman was wroth, and went away, and said, Behold, I thought he will surely come out to me, and stand, and call on the name of the Lord his God, and strike his hand over the place, and recover the leper. Are not Abana and Pharpar, rivers of Damascus, better than all the waters of Israel? May I not wash in them and be clean? So he turned and went away in a rage." Blind impetuosity of passion! to what a degree of absurdity would it hurry deluded mortals, were it not sometimes curbed in its mad career. Happy is it for those who have some friendly monitor at hand, to watch its impatient sallies, and check its growing violence.

The servants of the enraged Syrian, who were not so immediately interested, and who, it is probable, had been habituated to a life of more restraint, could view the transaction with dispassionate attention; and, therefore, with the utmost reason and propriety, "came near, and spake unto him, and said, My Father, if the Prophet had bid thee do some great thing, wouldest thou not have done it? How much rather then when he saith to thee, Wash, and be clean?" Though passionate, he was not malignant; though impetuous, he was not inflexible. The admonition that was so reasonable in itself, and delivered in such respectful language, produced the desired effect; so "he went down and dipped himself seven times in Jordan, ac-

ording to the saying of the man of God; and his flesh came again like unto the flesh of a little child, and he was clean."

From this particular enumeration of the circumstances which attended this miraculous transaction, the following inferences seem naturally to arise.

1. From the evidence of *miracles* is derived one of the strongest arguments for the truth of that holy religion which claims its origin from God. When those, who assert that they come with a commission from *heaven*, are invested with the power of controlling the established laws of nature; of performing such stupendous works, as to the eye of reason evidently appear beyond the reach of any natural cause, we cannot but acknowledge the interposition of the *divine power*; and that, therefore, the words which are delivered in God's name are the *words of truth*. When Moses was sent to rescue the people of Israel from the Egyptian bondage, and to give them ordinances for a civil and religious establishment, "God said unto him, take this rod in thine hand, wherewith thou shalt do *signs*." With *this* he wrought wonders in the land of Egypt, to the confusion of Pharaoh and his servants. With *this*, to allay the murmurs of the Israelites, he smote the stony rock, so that the waters gushed out; and divided the Red Sea, so that the people passed through, as on dry ground. From all which circumstances, he had abundant reason to say, as he said in the miraculous destruction of Korah and his company, "hereby ye shall *know* that the *Lord* hath sent me to do all these works; for I have not done them of mine own mind."

When Elijah, one of the great reformers of Israel, had a contest with the Prophets of Baal, by an astonishing miracle, he carried conviction at once to the minds of the people, who exclaimed, "The Lord, he is the God; the Lord, he is the God."

And thus, in the instance of which we have now been treating, no sooner was Naaman recovered in such a preternatural manner, than he returned to the man of God, and ingenuously acknowledged, "Behold, now I *know*, that there is no God in all the earth, but in Israel." The gospel of Jesus Christ is, in a great measure, supported by the same sort of evidence. *He*, at whose command the blind received their sight, the lame walked, the lepers were cleansed, the deaf heard, and the dead

were raised up—*He* that could perform such works as these, might well challenge the attention of the people, as a teacher sent from God, and make this unanswerable appeal to them, “Believe me, on the authority of my own word, that I am in the Father, and the Father in me; or else believe me for the *very work’s sake.*”

The religion of Jesus Christ was rapidly extended by the evident interposition of divine power, through the greater part of the known world. Established on a rock, it has hitherto continued, and, we trust, the gates of hell will never prevail against it. This is the religion which we all profess to believe. It becomes us, therefore, to receive it with implicit confidence, and to honour it by universal obedience. Let us fulfil its precepts; be warned by its threatnings; and we may rest assured, that all its promises (however difficult it may now appear) will in due time be accomplished by the almighty power of its Divine Author.

2. Whenever the will of God in any particular instance is clearly revealed, it is our business to *obey*, and not to *dispute*. Things that were indifferent at first, when they come to have the sanction of divine appointment, become matters of absolute necessity. You frequently hear the enemies of revelation affirming, “that God is a being of infinite mercy; that he is always ready to hear the prayers of his rational creatures; that his compassion will induce him to *pardon*, if we *repent*; that his goodness will necessarily lead him to make us happy; that, therefore, there is no necessity for an atonement for sin, nor for the intercession of a Saviour between God and man.” But if in contradiction to this supposition, it be positively declared, that God *did* require an atonement for sin, before he would justify the sinner; if he has commanded us to draw near to him, only through the mediation of his Son Jesus Christ; and if, in his name alone we are required to offer up all our religious services; does it become *us* to point out to the Almighty another mode of acceptance? Would there be any *modesty* in rejecting the terms of favour, and yet hoping for his mercy? Can we expect to reach the object of our wishes, and yet wilfully deviate from the path prescribed?

Luke-warm Christians will sometimes speak in disrespectful language of the positive institution of our religion—of the

Lord's day, and the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's supper. "May we not (say they) serve God, on any other day, as well as on Sunday; and in our own houses, as well as in the great congregation? And as to the sacraments, what are they but outward ceremonies? We can worship God in spirit and in truth, though we disregard these external signs of devotion!" But here, the same argument again recurs. *Are you indeed required to remember the Lord's day to keep it holy, not to forget the assembling of yourselves together, to be baptized with water in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and to celebrate the Lord's supper, in remembrance of your once suffering Saviour? And will you still cavil, and object, and dispute the propriety of these injunctions? This is the very spirit of Naaman.* The prophet had directed a particular way for his recovery; his own fond imagination had devised another method. "I thought, he will surely come out to me, and stand and call on the name of the Lord his God, and strike his hand over the place, and recover the leper. Are not Abana and Pharpar, rivers of Damascus, better than all the waters of Israel? May I not wash in *them*, and be clean?" But had he not acted in exact conformity to the saying of the man of God; had he not gone down to that very river of Jordan, and dipped himself seven times, never would he have recovered from his dreadful malady.

Lastly, Although it is your indispensable duty to comply with all the positive institutions of our religion, yet, let us rest not here. These are but subordinate parts of our religious service. They must be made subservient to the more exalted purpose of improving us in *vital* religion; of cleansing us from the pollutions of sin, as the leprosy of Naaman was washed away; of making us more attentive to the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy and truth; of rendering us holy, as God is holy, and perfect, as our Father who is in heaven is perfect. These are qualifications, the happy influence of which will extend through eternal ages. Let the external rites of our religion be the means of prompting us to live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world; let them elevate our conversation from earth to heaven. And then, those pure and spiritual gratifications, which in this world are but imperfectly tasted, will become hereafter the fullness of joy. We shall be translated from

the delightful services of God's house on earth, to the more exalted devotions, which are celebrated in his temple not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.

For the Churchman's Magazine.

(From a Correspondent.)

A Comparison of the Controversy between the Calvinists and the Arminians with the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans.

Introduction.

EVER since the writer of this supposed himself possessed of an understanding of the Epistle to the Romans, it has appeared to him an extraordinary fact, that, in the controversy between the Calvinists and the Arminians, the book should be constantly appealed to, on both sides; and, by the former, more than any other book of Scripture; when, according to the opinion here entertained, the Epistle contains nothing directly to the purpose of the matter at issue, between the litigants. To prove this, is the end of the present undertaking.

The first satisfactory knowledge of the Epistle which the author received, was from the perusal of the exposition of Mr. Locke. This eminent person was not ashamed to confess, that, after having been long conversant in the Epistles of St. Paul, he made the discovery, that he had not understood the doctrinal and discursive parts of them. The most prominent expedient adopted by him, for the obtaining of a right knowledge of the Epistle, was the studying of it under the recollection of the continual series of its general argument. But besides this, so evidently agreeable to the dictates of right reason; he noticed in the composition some properties which have had their effect on his whole commentary; but which had been overlooked or else regarded slightly, by the commentators who preceded him.

Under impressions similar to those of Mr. Locke, but in a form accommodated to the design of the present work, the author of it goes on to notice, as the first property of the Epistle, to his purpose, its being not didactic, but argumentative. Under this remark, however, there are included the first eleven

chapters only : so that all beyond them is foreign to the design. The twelfth chapter is a beautiful delineation of Christian morals. The thirteenth is admonition, not without a degree of censure ; probably designed to apply to some of those, whose cause St. Paul had been advocating ; although not relatively to the same subject. The fifteenth chapter is partly personal ; and partly contains miscellaneous remarks, on the subjects which had gone before. The only remaining chapter is devoted to Christian and friendly salutation ; not without a glance, in the conclusion, at the subject which had filled the body of the Epistle ; and which seems to have still pressed on the Apostle's mind. But as to the first eleven chapters, they are entirely argumentative : and if so ; when such a man as Mr. Locke pronounces St. Paul to be a coherent, an argumentative, and a pertinent writer ; it must be rash, in any other man, to suppose him continually falling into a kind of disputation, which an understanding of an ordinary size would reject. For instance, when he quotes a passage from the Old Testament ; to imagine that he makes a use of it, quite foreign to its sense in the place from which it comes ; or to suppose that he reasons from any matter, as a dictate of common sense and not itself requiring proof, while yet the truth of it is more doubtful, than the position which it is brought to prove ; is not to impute to him a conduct to be looked for, from such a reasoner. And especially it should be considered, that he was writing to an infant Church, consisting of two descriptions of persons, neither of whom he had seen ; and further, that one division of them were far from viewing what might come from him with a partial eye ; while yet these were the very people, whose prejudices were to be opposed ; who would therefore not be likely to overlook any part of the argument, which might be untenable. Under these circumstances, would St. Paul—would any of the Apostles—would any man of a common share of reason, sustain a disputed truth, by a medium of proof more likely to be contradicted, than that which was to be established by it ? We may presume, that they would not.*

* Mr. Locke considered the subject and the design of this Epistle, as much the same with that to the Galatians. But Mr. Taylor—the learned and ingenious Dissenting Minister of that name of Norwich—conceives of the striking difference, that the former was opposed to Judaism entire, and the latter,

Next it is to be remarked concerning this argumentative Epistle—the view being still confined to the first eleven chapters—that there is a unity of design in the argument of it; the Apostle labouring to prove, from the Jewish economy, that the Gentiles were to be partakers with the Jews of the benefits of the Christian covenant, without submitting to the ordinances of the Levitical law.*

This unity of design, if conspicuous on an attentive examination of the Epistle, must be a characteristic of it, to be kept in view into the explanation of every part of its contents. For that so close a reasoner as St. Paul, in a composition in which he is confessed the most perseveringly to regard the purpose of his writing; and having before him a controversy known to have existed at the time, should run into speculations, concerning which there is not the least historic evidence, that they then gave occasion to difference of religious sentiment among Chris-

to an intermixture of it with Christianity. It is a matter of delicacy, to decide between two such men. But as the author of this work finds it necessary to his design, he declares his opinion in favour of Mr. Locke; there being understood, however, this difference in the Epistles; which would doubtless have been allowed by Mr. Locke; that in the Epistle to the Romans, the Apostle advocated the liberty of the Gentile Christians; whereas, in the Epistle to the Galatians, he censured the same description of people, for being seduced from that liberty, into legal bondage. It must also be acknowledged, that unbelieving Jews are especially the subjects of discourse, in the second and part of the third chapters; and afterwards, in the ninth, tenth and eleventh; yet still, as falling in with the principal design, in favour of the Gentile converts and against the believing Jews. It does not appear, on what ground the unbelieving Jews can be supposed to have interested themselves in the question, concerning the terms of Christian communion, whether it should be accompanied by subjection to the institutions of the Law; or for what purpose the Apostle should to them reason from the extent of the consequences of Adam's sin, to a similar extent of the benefits of the death of Christ; when, in regard to the latter, they had no belief of any benefits resulting from it. It seems alike foreign to the conviction of the same description of persons, that there should be a reasoning from the justification of Abraham by faith, before the giving of the Law; to establish the like justification, without the deeds of the Law, under the Gospel.

* The Mr. Taylor, mentioned in the preceding note, makes an allusion to this effect, in favour of the property of the Epistle here stated. He supposes a person to have left him an estate by will; and that some other person disputes the donation; alleging an entail, and that he is heir at law. The legatee has occasion for an advocate, to disprove this claim. St. Paul, says Mr. Taylor, is that advocate.

If, as is here believed, the preceding comparison be correct; how erroneous might be any interpretation of the will, which should rest on passages in the pleadings, not taken in immediate connection with the points to which the pleader had applied them, particularly the entail!

tians ; must be seen, on the first view of the subject, to be altogether improbable. Under such circumstances as those stated, there may indeed be incidentally introduced truths, not bearing directly on the point at issue ; yet having relation to one or another medium of proof, brought in by the writer for the establishing of it. But authorities, originating in this manner, are an unsure foundation, on which to erect a complicated theory ; because the writer, contemplating them in the single point of view in which they relate to his design, cannot be expected to express himself concerning them as perspicuously, as if they were professedly the subjects of his disquisition. But if, to the passages thus incidentally introduced, there be given interpretations making them quite foreign to the purpose of the writer ; there needs not be any better proof—still keeping in view that the writer is St. Paul—of the incorrectness of such interpretations.

That there is in the Epistle the one design here affirmed, and that it is carried on without reference to other matters, any further than as they contributed to it, must depend for proof on such internal evidence, as it is hoped will appear in the investigation that is to follow. There may be a propriety, however, in stating in this place, such evidence as is obvious on the most cursory reading of the Epistle.

That such is the subject and that such is the one design under which it is conducted, is continually confirmed by the several parts of the composition ; the subjects of which, even when apparently wide of the main subject, are not dismissed without an application to it. For every reader may observe, that it is not in this Epistle of St. Paul, as in the Epistles of some of his fellow-Apostles, for instance, that of St. James ; in which the writer, having sundry subjects intended by him to be the groundwork of instruction, passes from one to another, without aiming at a connection. The same may be said of some of the Epistles of St. Paul himself ; for instance, the first Epistle to the Corinthians ; in which, however closely he applies to each subject, while it is immediately before him, yet he passes from one subject to another, without any notice of the transition. But in the Epistle to the Romans, from the time that the subject of Gentile communion is introduced, in the sixteenth verse of the first chapter, it is again and again brought up ; and not afterwards

lost sight of, until the end of the eleventh: nor even altogether then; for there is a short retrospect to it in the twelfth, and again in the fifteenth. What greatly adds to the weight of the present consideration, is the circumstance, that the one design supposed is the determination of a known difficulty of the day; in regard to the terms on which Gentile converts were to be admitted to Christian communion. They who, from Judaism, had embraced the Gospel, contended stiffly, that it was incumbent on the others to conform to the institutions of the law of Moses; to which they challenged perpetuity. Since then the composition is in a controversial form, why should it not be thought confined to the only known controversy, which shows its head in the course of the Apostle's argument?

Of the many commentators who do not support this unity of design, it is here conceived, that the circumstance has an unfavourable effect on their interpretations, however excellent they may have been in other respects. There shall be named two only; one of them Dr. Whitby, reputed an Arminian; the other of them Dr. Doddridge, a Calvinist, although not in the extreme. Dr. Whitby states two great doctrines, as within the contemplation of the Apostles; one of them, that of justification by faith alone; and the other, the mystery of the calling of the Gentiles. Now, although the former is largely treated of, as may be said of some other subjects; yet, there seems an error in understanding any of them to be treated of in any other point of view, than as aiding to the second point in the statement of Dr. Whitby. And had that learned man considered this as the one point, kept in view always in the Apostle's argument, and claiming the other points as tributary to it, the circumstances would probably have added to the usefulness of his judicious commentary.

Dr. Doddridge, who is here named with respect, states, as the leading subject of the Apostle, the excellency of the Gospel; which he represents as established by five prominent arguments. That the Epistle, immediately after the introductory salutation and expressions of regard, makes the declaration—"I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ;" and that this is a modest way of glorying in it; is very evident. And further, that not only the general design of the Epistle, but the tendency of each distinct part contributes to the asserted use, may be amply

conceded. But the opinion, that the Apostle sat down to impute, under the view of sustaining the sentiment, as the leading one of his intended composition; represents it not only as containing less of argument than of digression; but as presuming a controversy not existing. For surely, the Judaizing Christians, whatever disturbance they had occasioned to their less scrupulous brethren of the Gentiles, would not have admitted the imputation, that they were arraigning the excellency of the Gospel; acknowledged alike by the one party and by the other. Dr. Whitby elevates a subordinate design, to a rank that makes it co-ordinate with the principal: while Dr. Doddridge not only depresses the principal design from its proper station, and puts another in its stead; but does not even include the former among the five reasons in his preface, by which the latter is supported: allowing it no further consequence, than that of a posterior discussion in the last three chapters, which have a relation to this, or to any other of the subjects within our view.

The difference between the excellency of the Gospel, contemplated in the Epistle, and the same subject as assumed by Dr. Doddridge, may be illustrated thus. Let it be supposed, that a man were to propose to write a book, the subject of which were to be the excellency of the common law of England. This would bring before our minds, a range of very great extent. But if there were added to the proposal words to this effect—as relative to the equality which it establishes between the nobleman and the commoner, and between the rich man and the poor, in every question involving security of person and of property—there would be a limitation of the subject, which must be expected to have great effect on the disquisitions of the proposer. Now it is here conceived, that just such an effect should be produced, not only by evidence pervading the Epistle, of the limited design asserted, but by an intimation of it in the beginning; when the Apostle, after glorying in the Gospel as “the power of God unto salvation,” immediately adds—“to the Jew first and also to the Gentile.” He was indeed about to prove the excellency of the Gospel; but it was with an especial relation to the point stated.

It is next to be remarked, concerning this argumentative composition; that the one subject of the argument, already described as affecting Jews and Gentiles, is intended of them in

their collective and not in their individual capacities. For although a community is composed of individuals, yet it is evident, that there may be predicated a matter of the former, which does not apply to every of the latter. What shows, in a very strong point of view, this characteristic of national designation, is, that the Calvinistic writers generally, who disregard it until they reach the eleventh chapter, are obliged to admit it there; although applying it to the very expressions, to which they had denied it in the preceding chapters. The distinction, here sustained, may be made the more clear by the following comparison. It has been affirmed, of the French writers and of the English, that the former are the most distinguished by sprightliness, and the latter by solidity of thought. Now, it might be expected of any person, who should engage to demonstrate this characteristic difference, by writing or by discourse; that he would occasionally speak of the Frenchman and of the Englishman, as if individually designated; and again make use of general terms, including, literally and strictly taken, all Frenchmen and all Englishmen in the position, although nothing would be further from his intention. As far from the Apostle's intention is a similar universality, when he introduces the Jew on one hand and the Gentile on the other; and when he seems to affirm of all Jews and of all Gentiles, what the connection shows to be true of each description of persons, no further than collectively and nationally.

Another property of the Epistle, in relation to the collective bodies of men comprehended under the argument of it, is its speaking of their respective privileges, as belonging to a state of covenant with God in this world; and not to a state of reward and punishment hereafter. No doubt, the kingdom of God on earth being instituted with a view to a better kingdom in the heavens, it is natural to expect of a writer, especially of one under the influence of inspiration, that, in unfolding what belongs to the former, he should have his heart warmed and his thoughts elevated by the contemplating of the more transcendent glories of the latter. Accordingly, we find such an effect of the foretaste of heaven, in this Epistle of St. Paul. Still the subjects, although kindred, are not the same: and therefore the Apostle never loses sight of his proper subject; which is the Messiah's spiritual reign on earth, over a people calling

on and called by his name. It may not only be remarked under this head, as under the preceding, that the Calvinistic writers generally are sure to adopt in the eleventh chapter what they had rejected in the chapters preceding; but of Dr. Doddridge in particular, that although he had rejected the other allied principle of national designation, as supported by Mr. Locke; yet, so early as in his interpretation, in the ninth chapter, of the expressions applied by Calvinists to the conditions in another life of the persons mentioned—such is the candour of the man—he gives some of them the construction here contended for; and avoids, in regard to others, the awful emphasis which his system seems to call for.

The distinction here affirmed may be elucidated in the following manner. If we were asserting the common right of a co-heir, with another co-heir, to an interest in a large estate; and if both of them were minors; it would be natural, to have some reference in our discourse to the great value of the possession; and to the honours and enjoyments hereafter to be attached to it, in the tenure of him for whom we claim. And yet, there could be no absolute certainty, that, if there should be an acknowledgment of his right, he would live to enter on the inheritance. In like manner, there may be contemplated a connection between the covenant state on earth and the blessedness of heaven, to which it is introductory; although it may happen of any present subject of the former, that he shall not reach the latter.

The last particular of the Epistle to be stated, is the implication in it, of a distinction between the state of covenant with God, affirmed under the preceding head; and the exclusive possession of the divine favour, in reference to another life, while that covenant continued; a distinction which will of course apply, under the Christian economy also: that is, neither in the one nor in the other, is salvation limited to a state of visible covenant. As the passages of the Epistle, on the ground of which the affirmation is here made, will not come under review in the comparison that is to follow, there may be a propriety in offering them in this place.

There are the first two verses of the third chapter; from which the position to be now maintained is an obvious inference. The Apostle had been asserting the admission of the

Gentiles within the pale of the Gospel, on equal terms with the Jews. These are supposed to object—"What advantage, then, hath the Jew? Or what profit is there in circumcision?" Had there been no possibility of salvation, during the existence of the Jewish economy, except to those who were the subjects of it; this would have been their pre-eminent advantage; although to be enjoyed henceforward by the Gentiles also. But the answer of the Apostle rests on a very different foundation—"Much [says he] every way; chiefly because unto them were committed the oracles of God." Great had been the benefit to them of the deposit here mentioned, as a manifestation of the divine perfections; as a directory of life; and as figurative, in a variety of ways, of a promised seed, in which all mankind were interested. But had the Apostle conceived of the legal covenant, as the only dispensation of providence admitting of salvation; there would seem an inconsistency, in the assigning of so limited a sphere, to the advantage of having been exclusively in the possession of it.

Another passage, is in the fourth and fifth verses of the ninth chapter; in which the past pre-eminence of the Jews is more amplified thus—"Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption; and the glory and the covenant and the giving of the law and the service of God and the promises; whose are the Fathers; and of whom, Christ came; who is over all, God blessed for ever; Amen." All this might have been more briefly and pointedly given in the remark, that the Jews only had been the proper subjects of salvation, were it applicable. But no: they had been the chosen people of God, for the accomplishing of a purpose, which runs through the whole series of his dispensations to mankind, from the creation to the consummation of all things. They and all others will be responsible for an improvement of whatever light has been afforded them.

But the passage in the Epistle speaking the most strongly to the point, is in the second chapter, from the eighth to the sixteenth. The Apostle, having denounced the threatening of "indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil to the Jew first and also to the Gentile," adds—"But glory, honour and peace to every man that worketh good, to the Jew first and also to the Gentile." There is

no plausible way of evading the application of this; except by supposing, that the Apostle speaks of the converted Gentiles: But this is inconsistent with the evident tenor of the passage, taken in connection with what went before; in which it had been said of the divine Being—"who will render to every man according to his deeds." There may, indeed, be taken another course; the supposing that the Apostle speaks of a perfect obedience, not paid by any: but this would be to represent him as speaking to no purpose. By well-doing, he must have meant a good life and conversation, according to the ideas annexed by common use to the expression. He goes on—"For there is no respect of persons with God:" that is, say some, no respect to any man, on account of his riches, or of his station, or of any other of the advantages of life; intimating, that the proposition is intended of these subjects only. But this does not consist with the sense, which respects morality of action; and that of men under different dispensations of providence. The words must have the same meaning here, as when used by St. Peter, in the tenth chapter of the Acts; where this Apostle, after saying—"God is no respecter of persons," adds—"for in every nation, he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted with him."

That the same is the sentiment in the place before us, is evident in what follows—"For as many as have sinned without Law shall also perish without Law; and as many as have sinned in the Law shall be judged by the Law." There is no reason, why there should be different rules of judgment in the different cases; unless on a principle which shall establish different standards of duties respectively required. The thread of the discourse is continued thus—"For not the hearers of the Law shall be just before God, but the doers of the Law shall be justified." "The doers of the Law;" meaning in a sense, in which alone such a description of persons could have been introduced; that is, as applying to every upright and religious person under the Law; and not doers in the sense of sinless perfection; there having been no such persons. In what follows, a question may arise, whether the words "by nature" (*φύσει*) should be attached to the second clause of the sentence, as in the present translation, or to the word "Gentiles" in the first clause; which will

make it descriptive of the converted Gentiles. But this is going very far back for a verbal connection ; besides that the purpose for which it is done is inconsistent with the Apostle's design, demonstrated throughout the passage. It is therefore here concluded, that the passage should be agreeably to the translation—"When the Gentiles who have not the Law, do by nature the things contained in the Law"—by nature, not as distinguished from grace, but as descriptive of their condition, without the benefit of revelation ;"* "they, having not the Law," that is, the Mosaic, "are a Law unto themselves ;" not that it is less the Law of God than the other, although described as a part of themselves, in respect to its being an inward and not an outward Law : "Which show the work of the Law written in their hearts ;" their conformity to it being the result of their judgment and the object of their desire : "Their consciences also bearing witness," on a comparison of their actions with that inward Law ; "and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another," by mutual reasonings on the innocence or the guilt of their conduct. The passage concludes thus—"in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men, by Jesus Christ, according to my Gospel :"^{*} these words being connected with the twelfth verse ; for the intermediate verses are as a parenthesis ; which is so evident, as to permit no colour to the absurd sense, imagined by some, that, in the great day, the Gospel will be the rule of judgment, indiscriminately laid on all.

It should be remarked concerning this passage, for the sake of the effect of the remark on what will hereafter be observed on the passages before and following ; that, whereas these are descriptive of national depravity of manners, the intermediate passage speaks of individual character and conduct. So that while heathen communities exhibited evidences of all the enormous crimes displayed in the first chapter ; and while the Jewish community was chargeable with consenting to and imitating the heathen practices, which their law condemned ; there were, both among the heathen and among the Jews, individual characters free from the prevalent contagion ; and not

* The expression "by nature" is used in this sense in Gal. ii. 15. .

labouring under the judgment which the justice of God had pronounced, "against every soul of man that doeth evil."*

Of the five particulars included in this introduction; the first four are peculiarly attached to the Epistle, which is to be a subject of this comparison; and must depend for proof, on the Epistle only. But the last particular, if correct, may be expected to appear a distinguishing property of scripture generally: And this it is here conceived, might be easily proved; if it were within the limits of the design, to travel beyond the bounds of the Epistle.

For the same reason of not wishing to take a wider range of disquisition than the design requires; the author proposes, under every point of the contemplated controversy, to fix the attention on the leading matter put to issue between the contending parties; bringing in, however, under the third and fourth points, certain subjects which they involve; although not explicitly declared in the points, as usually stated. The subjects here in view appear to be intimately connected with large portions of the Epistle.

Perhaps it may be expected of him, to deliver, under each point, his own opinion of the sense of scripture, in relation to that department of the controversy. But he is desirous of maintaining, throughout the comparison, the manner which would become a man having no bias either to Calvinism or to

* The criticism noticed, of connecting the words "by nature," with the word "Gentiles," was learned by the author from a tract "on the law of nature," in the collection called "the Scholar armed." When he first read it in that ingenious discourse, he thought he perceived some probability in the point intended to be established, that the passage refers to the Gentile Christians. But, on consideration, he judges such an opinion utterly inconsistent with the ground taken by the Apostle; and accordingly follows the sense which has been usual.

It is a pleasure to the writer of this to remark, that Dr. Doddridge's interpretation of the whole passage harmonises with the sense which has been here given. He does not, indeed, unequivocally affirm, that there are virtuous heathen, who will be approved of in the day of final judgment; but what he says seems manifestly to point to that result. It is true, that, when he comes to his improvement, he weakens in some measure, the force of his interpretation, by saying as follows—"Nor are we concerned to know, how the heathen will fare in it (the judgment). Let it suffice us, that if they are condemned, they will be righteously condemned; not for remaining ignorant of the Gospel they never had an opportunity of hearing, but for violating those precepts of the divine Law, which were inscribed on their consciences." Even under this hypothetical proposition, it is here thought, there may be discerned in the writer's mind more than he held it prudent to declare.

Arminianism; nor yet any opinion of his own, on the subject generally; or who, on the other hand, might belong to either of the two parties; yet conceive of his own cause, that it would be injured, as indeed every good cause must by arguments which do not apply. This line of conduct, however, dictates the requesting of the reader, that he will not consider the author as objecting or as indifferent to any truth of christianity; merely on the ground, that he does not find it directly brought in this Epistle.

(To be continued.)

For the Churchman's Magazine.

EPISCOPACY VINDICATED:

In a series of Letters to the Rev. Dr. MILLER, by the Rev. JAMES KEMP, D.D. Rector of Great Choptank Parish, Dorchester County, Maryland.

[Continued from page 266.]

LETTER III.

On the analogy between the Jewish and Christian Priesthood. The ministry of the Church while our Lord was here on earth. Deacons, a regularly ordained order of Ministers. The Apostles had no extraordinary ministry, but extraordinary gifts. Before the canon of Scripture was completed, they were the source of truth, and, on this account, they instructed and directed Ministers of every order. Our Bishops are vested with the same authority that Timothy and Titus possessed. Presbyterian Moderators are not. Who the Angels in the Revelations were. The use Episcopalians make of the Fathers. The parallel between the evidence for the first-day Sabbath, and infant baptism, and the evidence for Episcopacy.

WE have now seen what the Scriptures say in support of each of our systems. But before I pass on to the examination of your other arguments, I must notice your statement of our doctrine. You say, p. 71, that Episcopalians "appeal to Scripture to prove that Bishops are an order of Clergy superior to Presbyters; that their superiority rests on the appointment of

Christ; and that with this superior order alone are deposited all the treasures of ministerial authority and succession." We do appeal to Scripture to prove the superiority of the order that we now call Bishops to Presbyters; and that with this order alone is deposited the right of *ordination*, and that through it is to be continued the succession. And for this we plead "*plain undoubted example*." Of assumptions we are not fond; and on analogies we only depend for illustration of our arguments and confirmation of our proofs.

In stating Episcopal arguments you are sometimes incorrect. And, of course, all your subsequent reasoning is unfounded or misapplicable. You must only expect us to admit arguments grounded on our own principles, and not on principles that do not belong to us.

I. You say we urge this argument, "that as the Mosaic economy was intended to prefigure the Gospel dispensation, we may reasonably suppose the Christian ministry to be modelled after the *Jewish Priesthood*; and that, as there were, in the Temple service, an *High Priest*, *Priests*, and *Levites*, so we may consider it as agreeable to the will of Christ, that there should be the corresponding orders of *Bishops*, *Priests*, and *Deacons*, in the New Testament Church." p. 72.

We do not maintain, that because there were three orders in the Jewish Priesthood, there must *absolutely* be three in the Christian. We do not assert, that if there had been no proof that three orders were instituted in the Church, the inference would have been *clear*, that the Christian ministry must be fixed upon the same plan. But considering the intimate connection between the two dispensations, and the typical nature of the positive institution of the former, we contend that the Episcopal plan, established by divine authority, preserves a fine and noble consistency between the various parts of both systems.

You say that this is a Popish argument, and that the Papists alone have made legitimate use of it, by having an universal Bishop. I imagine you mean, that the *Substance* must have only one of the highest order, as the *Type* had one. But do you not perceive, that to require this exact resemblance will destroy your own doctrine, that the Jewish Priesthood was a type of Christ? How could a Priesthood of three orders be a type, according to your ideas, of one great High Priest? And if I

am not mistaken, the whole argument of St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Hebrews, goes to show that the Jewish *High Priest*, and not the three orders of the Priesthood, was the type of Christ.

The resemblance between the Jewish and Christian system can only be expected to be *general*. The great object to which they both referred was the atonement of Christ. To this the former looked forward, as the latter looks back. They were both of the nature of a covenant, and their members were both distinguished by covenant marks. The former had a Priesthood to administer its holy rites, which prefigured the grand sacrifice. The latter has a Priesthood to perform its more spiritual ordinances, to apply this atonement to its members. Although the Temple of Jerusalem was a type of the Church, yet, under Christianity, we find that worship was not confined to one place, nor acceptable rites to be performed only at Jerusalem. As far then as this varied from the former dispensation, so far, it must be expected, would the Priesthood vary. As the great atonement was to be held in remembrance, and applied in every country and nation, so there must be a number of High Priests for this sacred office.

As to the titles under the Old Testament being discontinued, there would hence arise no kind of proof, that there was no similarity in the ministry. High Priest and sacrifice were things that a Jew could not separate. And had the title of the officer been retained, the Jew would have been apt to insist that the sacrifice might be performed as before. But *officers* and *duties* are the things to be considered, and not *titles*.

Whatever weight the names of great divines may be admitted to have, on this subject, is certainly on our side. *Stillington*, *Harveis* and *Mosheim* you have quoted in support of your doctrine. The Irenicum of *Stillington* was an early and incorrect production. *Harveis* is held in little estimation by Churchmen, and, I rather think, you will not subscribe to some of his opinions. *Mosheim* is learned, but not always clear or correct. Still, what are these to the multitude we could adduce? We might begin with your favourite St. Jerome. He, in his Epistle to Evagrius, distinctly says, "what the High Priest, Priests, and Levites were in the Temple, the Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons are in the Church." The same doctrine was main-

tained and ably illustrated by the pious and acute Dr. Hickes. To whom I might add Dr. Barrow, Bishop Horne, Bishop Horsley, Bishop Skinner, Bishop Seabury, Mr. Charles Leslie, Archdeacon Daubeny, the Rev. William Jones, and many others of great celebrity in the Church.

That the reformers should wish to discontinue the word *altar*, is not to be wondered at, because it was connected with some of the most prominent errors of Popery. But we find that the word *θυσιαστήριον*, *altar*, was used in the primitive Church for the table on which was placed the memorials of the sacrifice of the death of Christ. "There is but one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup unto the unity of his blood; one *altar*, as also there is one Bishop, together with his Presbytery and the Deacons, my fellow servants, that so whatsoever ye do, ye may do it according to the will of God." Ignat. Epist. Philadel. And even the Apostle Paul, in his Epistle to the Hebrews, says, "we have an *altar*, of which they have no right to eat, which serve the tabernacle." This certainly is a language which countenances our ideas of the Eucharist and Christian Priesthood, and greatly strengthens the supposition, that a fine and consistent analogy pervades the whole plan of grace.

II. The second "argument urged by Episcopal writers," you say, is—"that we actually find three distinct orders of Gospel ministers appointed by Christ, or under his authority, viz. *Apostles*, the *seventy Disciples*, and *Deacons*; and that these correspond with the diocesan Bishops, the Presbyters, and the Deacons of their Church."

Considering this, I imagine, as the general doctrine of Episcopalians, you have quoted some author to invalidate it. But, Sir, I must deny that this is the doctrine of Episcopalians. And I know of no standard book, or any generally esteemed writers that maintain any such argument.

We consider the Christian ministry as commencing only from our Lord's commission after the resurrection. It is true, we think we see a ministry of three grades during the time of Christ's sojourning on earth. We perceive him and the Apostles, and the disciples all clearly distinguished. We see him retaining the supreme power in his own hands, until he was about to ascend to heaven; and then communicating it to others.

And if he appointed under him inferior ministers, to whom he only delegated certain duties, is there not a strong ground of presumption, previously to all facts, that his Apostles would do the same? They stood in his room in the visible Church as to its ministry.

You seem to think, that we are involved in an inextricable difficulty as to our three orders, at the time "immediately after the ascension of Christ." Into what a small compass controverted subjects would generally be brought, if we could only refrain from charging our adversaries with opinions which they do not hold, and perplexing our arguments with unnecessary and feeble appendages! We hold, that the complete organization of the Church was left to the Apostles; and whatever arrangements were made by them to bring its polity to a stable and permanent state, we believe to be of divine appointment. While the old dispensation was gradually extinguished, the new gradually arose.

I might now, I think, dismiss this head with great safety; but as you have here introduced the ordination and office of Deacons, it may not be improper to settle that point. "And in those days, when the number of the disciples were multiplied, there arose a murmuring of the Grecians against the HEBREWS, because their widows were neglected in the daily ministrations. Then the twelve called the multitude of the disciples unto them, and said, It is not reason that we should leave the word of God and serve tables. Wherefore, brethren, look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business. But we will give ourselves continually to prayer, and to the ministry of the word. And the saying pleased the whole multitude; and they chose Stephen, a man full of faith and of the Holy Ghost, and Philip, and Prochorus, and Nicanor, and Timon, and Parmenas, and Nicolas, a proselyte of Antioch; whom they set before the Apostles; and, when they had prayed, they laid their hands on them." Acts vi. I would ask any candid man, if there is any thing wanting here to a complete ordination? Prayer and the imposition of hands were used; and I would ask you, why you have departed from so clear and plain a scriptural precedent. For I find in your form of

government, that your Deacons are only *set apart by prayer*.* The truth is, your Deacons are strictly laymen, and you would not venture to use the solemn Apostolic admission of ministers to the mere appointment of lay-officers.

But, because the only purpose mentioned in the foregoing passage, for which Deacons were appointed, was "*to serve tables*," or to manage the charities of the Church, you seem to contend, that no other duties belonged to them. We are, in many cases, left to ascertain the extent of powers and the number of gifts, from the conduct of those that exercised those powers, or possessed these gifts. If we had no information respecting the number and the nature of the gifts of the Holy Spirit, but from the account of their first manifestation, on the day of Pentecost, we should have had no certainty, but as to the gift of tongues: While we have the most positive proof that Philip, one of the Deacons, thus ordained, both preached and baptized; and that this pious work of his was acknowledged by the Apostles at Jerusalem, we cannot but believe that he was a regular minister.

Yet you think it *probable*, that Philip, before he preached, was advanced to the office of an *Evangelist*. This is a mere probability, without the shadow of proof. Besides, will you venture to teach your followers that Evangelist was ever the *appropriate* title of an order in the Church? When ministers were sent to preach the Gospel, where it had never before been known, they were often termed Evangelists, no matter of what order they were.

It would appear then, that nothing could be more decidedly fixed by Apostolic practice, than that Deacons baptized and preached. And if persons who performed these offices, under regular ordination, were not ministers, the world has yet to learn what designates a minister. And I am really at a loss to conceive how it can be pretended that this part of your polity is not an undeniable deviation from divine appointment.

III. The next argument which you undertake to confute, is, "that the Apostles, while they lived, held a station in the Church superior to all other ministers; that *Bishops* are the proper successors of the *Apostles*; and that they hold a corresponding superiority of character and office."

* Confession of Faith, page 318.

It seems you have no way of combating this position, but by bringing in your "extraordinary ministry" of the Apostles. In what passage of Scripture is this extraordinary ministry either mentioned or alluded to? I answer, decidedly, in none. It is a mere assumption, without facts, and without reasons to support it.

The ministerial *duties* of the Apostles were, in general terms, included in their commission. "*Go ye and teach (make disciples of) all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.*" This implies, that they were to convert the world to the religion of Christ, to admit persons into his spiritual community, and to instruct them fully in all things required of its members. And the promise of perpetual continuance is given to this commission. To the end of the world then the ministerial duties will and must be the same.

But the infantine state of the Church, the deep depravity of the world, and the strong habits of idolatry, required extraordinary *powers* in these first ministers. Consequently, before they were permitted to act under their commission, they were endued with these powers. The gift of "*wisdom*," the gift of "*knowledge*," the gift of "*faith*," the gift of "*healing*," the gift of "*working miracles*," the gift of "*prophecy*," the gift of "*discerning spirits*," the gift of "*tongues*," the gift of the "*interpretation of tongues*," were all conferred upon them. But these gifts had no more connection with the ministerial duties than learning has with the performance of the office of baptism. These were instruments by which the ministerial commission was to be carried into effect. The true difference then between the Apostles and their future successors was, that by means of *different powers* they performed the *same duties*.

The source of knowledge too was different. The Apostles drew their knowledge from the instructions and conduct of their Lord, in which they were kept correct by the Holy Spirit, and from immediate inspiration. Their successors drew theirs from the Scriptures. But these things are all essentially different. And yet it is upon a blending of these together that your extraordinary ministry rests. The source of knowledge, the

powers, and duties of ministers, are things as distinctly differing as a book on tactics, implements of war, and the conquering of an enemy.

Episcopalians, therefore, think they speak correctly when they maintain that their Bishops have the same commission, and discharge the same ministerial functions that the Apostles did; that they hold the same station in the Church, and possess the same superiority over inferior ministers. Unable to resist the proof of this superiority, you have resorted to an expedient that will not bear the slightest examination.

Nor are you less incorrect in saying, that Episcopalians refer you to no passages of Scripture in proof of their Bishops being the successors of the Apostles, in their full ministerial capacity. You see we maintain this upon scriptural ground. And then it follows, by your own admission, that they must have inferiors in the ministry. We only resort to the Fathers to corroborate our scriptural grounds. And having enough that is clear and decisive, we pass over "*vague suggestions*." As the venerable St. Ignatius will come under consideration in another place, I shall only say here, that you have quoted *half sentences*, from which nothing can safely be concluded. The last quotation but one stands thus complete in the Author: "It is therefore necessary, that as ye do, so without your Bishop you should do nothing; as also, be ye subject to your Presbyters, as to the Apostle of Jesus Christ our hope. The Deacons also, being the ministers of the mysteries of Jesus Christ, must, by all means, study to please all." Here we have the three orders that Episcopalians contend for, and here, Sir, we have a proof that *Deacons were then ministers*.

Still you think we are involved in a sad difficulty, on account of the directions given by the Apostle to Timothy and Titus, which nothing can extricate us from but admitting an *extraordinary power*. You will perceive, that we do not blend power and ministry. But would not all this difficulty be removed by the consideration, that these directions might be given, because the Apostles were then the standard of truth, or because they were much older in the ministry? This has no bearing at all upon our doctrine, while we see clear proof that Timothy and Titus were invested with the right of ordaining and ruling Presbyters and Deacons.

The truly pious and learned Dr. John Scott says, "that the true government of the Church is Episcopal, is evident from the practice of the Holy Apostles, who, pursuant to the institution of our Saviour, did not only exercise that *superiority* in their own persons which their office gave them over their inferior clergy, but also *derived it down* with their office to their *successors*."* Nor is Dr. Barrow less decided upon this subject, although you have represented him as having given up the point.†

IV. Your fourth Episcopal argument is, "that *Timothy* and *Titus* were each appointed to the fixed superintendency of a large diocese, the former over *Ephesus*, the latter over *Crete*; that the duties required of them, and the powers vested in them, were evidently superior to those of ordinary Presbyters; in a word, that they were no other than proper *diocesan Bishops*."

You have here again put the argument in your own form, and adduced Dr. Whitby, a very learned divine, to confute it. For my part, I can see no injury that can arise to the Episcopal cause, from admitting that *Timothy* and *Titus* were not immoveably fixed at *Ephesus* and *Crete*. If we find that the duties required of them, and the authority vested in them, were evidently superior to those of common Presbyters, our argument will stand good.

But you say, "they are no where in Scripture called Bishops." Are they any where called Moderators? No. Whatever conclusion there is to be drawn from this, operates equally against you as against us. But we aver, that they were endued with the authority, and performed the duties of Bishops. This you will not venture to assert is the case as to your Moderators. For they have no power to *ordain*, what both *Timothy* and *Titus* evidently had. Nor does it appear to me, that this argument of ours is in the smallest degree weakened by your remarks.

1. In the beginning of this letter, you said you would require "passages of Scripture, which contain direct precept, *plain undoubted example*," &c. But here you say, "even if we allow

* Scott's Works, vol. i. p. 486.

† See his Sermon on Obedience to spiritual Guides and Governors.

Timothy and Titus to have held such a superior ecclesiastical rank as Episcopalians contend for, still no certain argument can be drawn from this case in favour of an established arrangement in the Church? Is not this something like contradiction? or a dereliction of principle? But Sir, our cause is not so weak as to stand upon a single instance. It is because we find no example of Presbyters ordaining—It is because we find Timothy and Titus both endued with the same authority—It is because the Apostles, and these exclusively, exercised the right of ordination and authority over Presbyters, taken in connection with many corroborating facts, that we fix our rules as to ordination and government. If a zealous hierarchist, a thousand years hence, should contend that the Archbishop of Canterbury presided at the consecration of the first American Bishops, and, therefore, the presidency of an Archbishop was necessary to a valid ordination, we might admit, that he had *zeal*, but we should deny that he had *knowledge*. But if he was to maintain that Presbyters of the Episcopal Church had no right to ordain, otherwise gentlemen would never have crossed the Atlantic for orders, so many years successively, we should allow him knowledge, whatever we might think of his zeal.

2. On your second remark, it may be observed, that Episcopalians are not obliged to abide by your statements nor to subscribe to your reasoning. We do not conclude that because our diocesan Bishops have a right to ordain and to govern Presbyters and Deacons, that Timothy and Titus, being vested with such rights, were therefore diocesan Bishops. But finding both Timothy and Titus clothed with authority over these inferior ministers, and endued with a right to ordain them, we conclude, that there was then an *order* in the ministry superior to Presbyters; and upon this ground we defend our Church polity. And while we have such a scriptural *warrant*, we shall continue to consider all the syllogisms of Presbyterian logicians as exclusively their own property.

3. You say, “we know not that there were any Church officers ordained, either at Ephesus or Crete, previously to the mission of Timothy or Titus.” And what if there were not? Can this affect the case in the smallest degree, while we are clearly ascertained that they were endued with the right of ordaining and governing Presbyters and Deacons? It is not upon

the circumstances of their *peculiar distinction*, or upon the situation of the churches to which they were sent, that Episcopals lay any stress, but on the plain and incontrovertible *fact* of their being *superior* to common Presbyters in rights and authority.

4. Your admission, under this head, renders the Episcopal doctrine, in addition to direct proof, highly probable and indeed rational. If there were ministers already in their places, and if these ministers, as you think probable, were involved in "*the disputes and animosities which prevailed*," what more feasible plan could be devised, than to send superior ministers to curb and to reclaim them. If ministers of the same rank and authority had been employed, might they not with great propriety have rejected their interference? But to send officers with power to try and condemn them, was at once acting with energy and good sense. The supposition that Timothy and Titus were mere common Presbyters leads to a variety of absurdities—*that a single Presbyterian can ordain Presbyters and Deacons, which do you not admit—that a single Presbyter can try and condemn other Presbyters, and that a single Presbyter can set in order the affairs of a church, even if there be in that church a number of other Presbyters of the same rank and authority.* Nothing then can be more at variance with the most generally admitted principles of Church polity, than your supposition, and, I may add, than your scheme of *parity* too.

5. The fifth remark which you say invalidates the argument under consideration, is really so futile, that it hardly deserves notice. "We know not that either Timothy or Titus, *alone*, ordained a single Presbyter at Ephesus or Crete." It is easy to suppose, that there were either a hundred or a thousand others with Timothy or Titus. But what weight will such a supposition have with a serious and impartial inquirer into truth, when he finds it declared in St. Paul's Epistle to Titus—*For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain Elders in every city, as I had appointed thee.* Tit. i. 5. For my own part, I can conceive nothing more decisive in proof of any doctrine than this is, that Titus was vested with power to ordain and to set in order whatever was necessary in Crete.

6. With regard to the date of St. Paul's first Epistle to Ti-

mothy, you ought in fairness, to have stated, that while some learned men maintain that it was written about the year 58, others equally learned contend, that it was written about the year 64, subsequent to St. Paul's first imprisonment at Rome. On this side of the question are Pearson, Le Clerk, L'Enfant, Cave, Mill, Whitby, Prettyman, &c. And I have no hesitation in saying, that the arguments of these learned men have produced entire conviction in my mind. The reader will find this subject very satisfactorily treated in Prettyman's Theology.

7. The fact already evinced nullifies your seventh remark. For if the true date of the Epistle to Timothy was in the year 64, this was after the period when the Acts of the Apostles close, and of course Timothy is left to be the diocesan Bishop of Ephesus. But suppose, for the sake of argument, that Timothy and Titus were not stationary, would that destroy their rights, or bring them down from their rank? If, because the situation of the Church in America requires that the Bishop of Maryland should sometimes go into the State of Delaware, upon Episcopal duties, it should be, some years hence, concluded, that he was not Bishop of the diocese of Maryland, or possessed the Episcopal office, the conclusion would be just as correct as Dr. Miller's. But would it satisfy a mind fair and unbiassed?

Finally—The last *remark* upon which you rely to destroy the Episcopal characters of Timothy and Titus, is, "That St. Paul always addresses them in the style of authority;" and that of course he must have been of a superior *order*. The discerning reader, who has perceived the clear and material distinction between extraordinary *offices* and extraordinary *powers*, and who has seen that the commission under which the Apostles acted, is the same with that under which all ministers act, will readily observe, that if there was any justice in your position, it would act equally against you, as against us, for it would prove that there were different orders in the Apostolic Church. But we can see nothing either in the Epistles to Timothy or Titus to justify your conclusion. The exhortations and directions are all given in the mild and affectionate manner of only a father in the faith. There is not the most remote hint at an exercise of authority, even if these directions should not

have been complied with. Whereas the right of Timothy and Titus to ordain Presbyters and Deacons, and to apply to them the discipline of the Church, are things so clear and express, as only to be denied by prejudice, or resisted by long cherished habits of thinking upon another system.

Let any person only enter fully and fairly into the state of things then in existence, and he will no longer be at a loss to account for the conduct of St. Paul to these ministers. There was no fixed standard of doctrines, for the Canon of Scripture was not yet completed. St. Paul possessed extraordinary gifts in the fullest proportion. And having ordained these successors, it became his duty to instruct them fully in the doctrines of the Gospel, as well as the discipline of the Church.

To obviate then every objection that ingenuity can raise against Episcopacy, seems only to require a suitable degree of attention to the nature of the Church, the offices and duties of the ministry, and the primitive state of things. Those difficulties that you imagine entangle the subject, have no immediate connection with the Episcopal grounds of proof. Episcopalians find that Timothy and Titus were vested with the right of ordaining and governing Presbyters and Deacons, and of setting in order the things that were wanting in the churches. But you want proof, that Timothy and Titus were to remain at Ephesus and Crete, without ever visiting the churches. You want proof of the number of their actual ordinations—You wish to know that there were previously Presbyters at Ephesus and Crete. But, pray, Sir, what is all this to the purpose? If you had been so fortunate as to have substantiated all these points, would it have altered the case one single iota, while we have the plain and undeniable declarations of holy writ, to vindicate us in an adherence to the opinion, that the office and duties of our Bishops are found in the model afforded by Timothy and Titus?

V. With regard to the *Angels* of the seven Churches mentioned in the Revelations, the very manner in which they are addressed, implies that they stand connected with these churches in the very way in which our Bishops are connected with theirs. They are addressed as persons in authority; they are addressed as having suffered the churches to decline; and the instructions to be conveyed to these churches are addressed to them. This,

taken in connection with a fact, than which few are better established, that at the time when these Revelations were communicated, there were Bishops in the several churches mentioned, gives still additional strength to the Episcopal doctrine, that a Bishop had then the *authority* for which we now contend. To suppose that these Angels were merely *Moderators*, or *Chairmen* of Presbyteries, would render the addresses equally at variance with experience and common sense. For *chairmen* are only officers appointed for the purpose of presiding in bodies for the transaction of business, and have no connection with them in any other capacity.

That these Angels were mere common Presbyters, the ministers of single congregations, is clearly untrue. For in the Church of Ephesus in particular, there were then a number of Presbyters, and still she is addressed through the Angel.*

VI. If I am not mistaken, Sir, you manage the passages from 1 Cor. xii. and Eph. iv. in your own way, and not in the way that Episcopalians treat them. The whole chapter in the *Colinthians* is an illustration of the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost, of their necessity and connection in the Church as a *single society*; that however various these gifts were, they were as necessary in their place as the different parts of the human body. In this body, too, on which these gifts were bestowed, there was government and officers. From this, then, I would only draw, besides the enumeration of the gifts of the Spirit, the admission of the fact, that the Church was a body, whose government was of divine origin. Nor can any thing more be deduced from the passage in Ephesians. For who ever pretended that Apostles, Prophets, and Evangelists, were different *orders*? Indeed, it is trifling with the subject to pretend that Episcopalians rely on these passages in proof of their form of Church polity.

I have now, Sir, gone through all your objections to the arguments drawn from Scripture in proof of the divine origin of Episcopacy, and I can say, with a sacred regard to truth, that I am not in the smallest degree shaken in my convictions by what you have said—a conviction not founded upon education and

* See Parkhurst on the word *αγγέλων*, and Scott's Christian Life on the Angels in the Revelations.

early prepossessions, but the result of examination and reflection. Indeed, you seem to me to have only hovered about the out-works, sometimes destroying a small part badly constructed and weakly defended; but the main work your arms have either not reached, or they have rebounded without effect. Nay, if you had demolished Episcopacy, I should still have been farther from your doctrine of parity than ever. For, with the aid of all your predecessors, you seem to have been unable to produce a single instance of Presbyterian ordination, one sound argument to prove that Presbyters were not inferior officers in the Apostolic Church, or any thing even to puzzle the clear proof, that Deacons were regularly ordained ministers of the Church.

I am not unable to account for the confidence which you express in *your* having destroyed even the *plausibility* of an argument. It is natural for parents to think well of their children. But I am entirely at a loss to account for some of your declarations, with regard to Episcopalians. "Scarcely," you say, "any two of their standard writers can agree upon any one principle of scriptural evidence." Page 118. You seem to have consulted a great many Episcopal divines. But I fear you have consulted them only to answer your purpose, otherwise you would have found a remarkable coincidence in the main points of their argument.

As to the use that Episcopalians make of the Fathers, you have treated that subject with a degree of confusion and want of precision, that was hardly to be looked for in a divine. Episcopalians consider Scripture as the only pure source of all truth, but they cheerfully avail themselves of the works of pious and learned men, and particularly of those who knew and conversed with the Apostles, in ascertaining the true meaning of Scripture. Good men, who had sufficient means of information, will always be received as credible witnesses in matters of fact. But the reason why you want to disparage the testimony of the Fathers, it is not very difficult to perceive. They are against you.

What the learned Dr. Johnson, of England, has said upon this subject, I should imagine, would prove a sufficient antidote for all the sophistry and declamation which have from time to time been used. "With regard to the order and government of the Primitive Church, we may doubtless follow the autho-

trity of the Fathers, with perfect security: they could not possibly be ignorant of laws executed, and customs practised, by themselves; nor would they, even supposing them corrupt, serve any interests of their own, by handing down false accounts to posterity. We are, therefore, to inquire from them the different orders established in the ministry from the Apostolic ages, the different employments of each, and their several ranks, subordinations, and degrees of authority.*

As to the parallel, in point of evidence, that has been sometimes drawn by Episcopalians, between the *fact* of the divine authority of Episcopacy, and the *facts* of the divine appointment of *infant baptism* and the *first day Sabbath*, you have somewhat distorted the positions laid down by us. We readily admit and defend the divine appointment of the Sabbath. And we consider the Apostolic practice as involving sufficient obligation for us to keep the *first day*. We consider the divine appointment of Church government as no less clear: and of the Apostolic practice of Episcopacy, we think we have, in Scripture, even more ample proof. We are well assured, that our Lord instituted baptism as the way to acquire Church-membership, and we have no doubt of the *right* of infants to membership. But, for my part, I am not prepared to admit that the proof of this *right* is more ample or more conclusive from Scripture, than the proof of the existence of Episcopacy.

You are gratified "to find such abundant evidence as you do in favour of both these ordinances in a number of early and authentic writers." This gratification we also enjoy, in its full extent, as to the subject of Episcopacy. And yet you blame us for having the least confidence in these writers.

Episcopacy, Sir, seems still unmoved, and I have the most complete assurance in my mind, that it will remain unmoved, as sure as the promise of him, who said, "*Lo! I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.*"

* See Sermons left for publication by Dr. Taylor, Preb. of Westminster, Ser. vii.

RELIGIOUS MEDITATIONS.*

No. I.

THE BIRTH OF CHRIST.

St. Luke i. 26.—*And, in the sixth month, the Angel Gabriel was sent from God unto a city of Galilee, named Nazareth; to a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David; and the virgin's name was Mary.—And the Angel came in unto her, and said, 'Hail, thou that art highly favoured! the Lord is with thee; blessed art thou among women.' And when she saw him, she was troubled at his saying, and cast in her mind what manner of salutation this should be. And the Angel said unto her, 'Fear not, Mary: for thou hast found favour with God. And behold! thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a Son, and shalt call his name JESUS. He shall be great, and shall be called THE SON OF THE HIGHEST: and the LORD GOD shall give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end.' Then said Mary unto the Angel, 'How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?' And the Angel answered and said unto her, 'THE HOLY GHOST shall come upon thee, and the power of the HIGHEST shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called THE SON OF GOD.'*

MEDITATION.

WELL may I exclaim with *St. Paul*, O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of GOD! when the SON OF GOD, that glorified Being in whom dwelt the *fulness of the Godhead*, condescended to be born of a virgin, and to take our mortal and imperfect state upon him; in order to save us sinful men, and make us heirs of everlasting life. Yet, however mean the circumstances of his birth, this REDEEMER, mighty to save, had such attendants on his entrance into this world, as the greatest monarchs must look up to with wonder.—The

* These are selected from the Cottager's Religious Meditations, published in England by the Society for bettering the Condition of the Poor.

most exalted heavenly Spirits descended to announce his birth. Choirs of Angels cheered the Sheepfolds near Bethlehem, during the night; repeating GLORY TO GOD IN THE HIGHEST! ON EARTH PEACE! GOOD WILL TOWARDS MEN! Seraphims hastened to celebrate the nativity of that REDEEMER, of whom all the Prophets did testify;—of that SAVIOUR, whose day Abraham desired to see, and saw it, and was glad.—Let me attend with reverence to the precepts of this divine teacher, and conform my life to his doctrine; treasuring up in my soul the words of everlasting life! So shall they be my guide and direction through this world of trial. So shall they be my comfort and consolation at the hour of death, and the means of my obtaining eternal happiness hereafter.

NO. II.

THE BAPTISM OF CHRIST.

St. Mat. iii. 13.—*Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John, to be baptized of him; but John forbade him, saying, 'I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me?' And Jesus answering said unto him, 'Suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness.' Then he suffered him. And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water: and, lo! the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the SPIRIT OF GOD descending like a dove, and lighting upon him: and, lo! a voice from heaven saying, 'THIS IS MY BELOVED SON, IN WHOM I AM WELL PLEASED.'*

MEDITATION.

OUR blessed SAVIOUR not only enjoined the rite of baptism in these remarkable words, addressed to his disciples: 'Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the FATHER, and of the SON, and of the HOLY GHOST:;' but he also enforced it by his own example. Though spotless and free from sin himself, yet for our sakes, he condescended to leave an example of submission to this ordinance of God; by using the appointed means of purification, in the sacrament of Baptism. Let me contemplate with awe and reverence, the approbation which the ALMIGHTY FATHER testified of the in-

stitution of Baptism, by the visible descent of his HOLY SPIRIT on our SAVIOUR *when he was baptized*; and let me ever bear in mind the solemn nature of this sacred ordinance, and the serious and devout attention with which it should be performed, in order to make a permanent and vital impression on all. Let me also reflect on the kind condescension, with which OUR SAVIOUR has ordered little children to be brought to him; and let this encourage me to bring my children to CHRIST by *Faith*, to commit them to him by *Baptism* and *Prayer*, and frequently to remind them of *their Baptismal Vow*; watching over their tender years, and bringing them up in the Fear of GOD, so that they may continue to be the everlasting objects of his care and love. Amen!

No. III.

THE LAMB OF GOD.

St. John i. 29.—*The next day, John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, 'BEHOLD THE LAMB OF GOD! which taketh away the sin of the world. This is he of whom I said, After me cometh a man, which is preferred before me: for he was before me. And I knew him not: but that he should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing with water.' And John bare record, saying, 'I saw the SPIRIT descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him. And I knew him not: but HE that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the SPIRIT descending, and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the HOLY GHOST. And I saw, and bare record that THIS IS THE SON OF GOD.'*

MEDITATION.

O THAT my faith may daily behold JESUS, the MEDIATOR of the new covenant, under the character of the LAMB OF GOD;—a lamb indeed without blemish, and without spot; by whose precious blood we are redeemed to God, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation,*—as by an infinitely more valuable ransom than silver and gold. May I with deep hu-

* Rev. v. 9.

military implore him to take away my sins ; and may I ever rejoice that he is the PROPITIATION, not for my sins only, but for the sins of the whole world. In him I behold the *great purifier* of mankind ; the divine person, whom the prophet *Isaiah* foretold, should be brought as a *Lamb* to the slaughter ; who should be wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities.* He, the *true Paschal Lamb*, hath through THE ETERNAL SPIRIT offered himself without spot to God ; and is become the MEDIATOR of the New Testament ; that by means of his death for our sins, we may be called to receive the promise of eternal inheritance. O ! may I so improve my appointed time here, that I may be at length permitted to unite with Angels and Archangels and all the company of Heaven, in that glorious song, ‘ Worthy is the LAMB that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing ;’ while, to my delight, I hear every person which is in Heaven, and on the Earth, and such as are in the Sea, and all that are in them, saying, ‘ Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto HIM that sitteth upon the Throne, and unto the LAMB FOR EVER AND EVER.’† AMEN.

NO. IV.

THE HISTORY OF NAAMAN.

2d Kings v. 9.—*So Naaman came with his horses and with his chariot, and stood at the door of the house of Elisha. And Elisha sent a messenger unto him, saying, ‘ Go and wash in Jordan seven times, and thy flesh shall come again to thee, and thou shalt be clean.’ But Naaman was wroth, and went away, and said, ‘ Behold, I thought, he will surely come out to me, and stand, and call on the name of the LORD HIS GOD, and strike his hand over the place, and recover the leper. Are not Abana and Pharphar, rivers of Damascus, better than all the waters of Israel? May I not wash in them, and be clean?’ So he turned and went away in a rage. And his servants came near, and spake unto him, and said, ‘ My father, if the prophet had bid thee do some great thing, wouldest thou not*

* *Isaiah* liii. 5.

† *Rev.* v.

have done it? how much rather then, when he said to thee, WASH AND BE CLEAN? Then went he down, and dipped himself seven times in Jordan, according to the saying of the man of God: and his flesh came again like unto the flesh of a little child, and he was clean.

MEDITATION.

MAY I observe here, that whoever is desirous of obtaining a blessing from the hand of God, must seek it in the manner he directs. If he will not accept his bounty in the way, and under the conditions, which he proposes, the suppliant will never obtain it. The ALMIGHTY God could have removed the leprosy of Naaman by various means; but the water of Jordan was the instrument which he thought fit to appoint; and, without it, Naaman might have gone down to his grave '*a leper as white as snow*.'—If I wish to be saved, I know it can only be through CHRIST. There is salvation through no other;—and I must bear in my mind that he will be no Saviour to me, unless through the grace of God, it is my constant study and endeavour to believe his revealed word, and to practise that which he hath commanded me to practice.—We are all of us infected with a disease, far more dangerous than that of Naaman; with SIN, *the leprosy of the soul*. CHRIST hath opened in his Gospel, by Baptism, a fountain for the washing away of that sin; and he hath made atonement for it, by the shedding of his own blood. He inviteth us to accept deliverance, to be cleansed,—to be made whole. Oh may I not despise the call; but fly to the fountain of living waters,—the fountain that is opened for sin and uncleanness,—the fountain that cometh forth from the house of the Lord;—lest my leprosy cleave unto me for ever.

No. V.

EXAMPLE OF JOHN THE BAPTIST.

St. John iii. 26.—*And they came unto John, and said unto him, ' Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou barest witness, behold, the same baptizeth, and all men come to him.' John answered and said, ' A man can receive nothing, except it be given him from Heaven. Ye yourselves bear me witness, that I said, I am not the CHRIST, but that I*

am sent before him. He that hath the bride is the bridegroom; but the friend of the bridegroom, which standeth and heareth him, rejoiceth greatly because of the bridegroom's voice: this my joy therefore is fulfilled. He must increase, but I must decrease.—He that cometh from above is above all: he that is of the earth is earthly, and speaketh of the earth: he that cometh from heaven is above all. And what he hath seen and heard, that he testifieth; and no man receiveth his testimony. He that hath received his testimony, hath set to his seal that GOD is true. For HE, whom GOD hath sent, speaketh the words of GOD; for GOD giveth not the SPIRIT by measure unto HIM. The FATHER loveth the SON, and hath given all things into his hand. He that believeth on the SON hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the SON, shall not see life; but the wrath of GOD abideth on him.

MEDITATION.

LET me meditate with improvement on the disposition of the HOLY BAPTIST; who rejoiced in the increasing power and reputation of CHRIST, though he knew it was to eclipse and extinguish his own. And yet, this was the man of whom OUR BLESSED SAVIOUR, who knew the hearts of all men, testified, that “Among them that are born of women, *there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist.*” By bearing in my mind the example of the humble and contented spirit of this truly great man, I shall avoid all tendency to the *mean and restless vice of envy*; which would prevent my enjoying with gratitude the comforts and hopes bestowed upon me by the mercy of GOD; because I see others greater, or richer, or more powerful than me: like the unhappy Haman, who could taste no earthly blessing while Mordecai was admitted into a share of the royal favour; and cried out in anguish of spirit, ‘All this availeth me nothing, so long as I see Mordecai the Jew sitting at the king’s gate.’*—Oh! may I be ever mindful that ‘*a man can receive nothing, except it be given him from Heaven.*’† It is GOD that maketh one man to differ from another; and nothing can be more unreasonable, than when I have received ALL from his bounty, *my eyes should be evil*, because he is good.‡

* Esther v. 13.

† John iii. 27.

‡ Matt. xx. 15.

No. VI.

THE BEATITUDES.

St. Mat. v. 1.—*And, seeing the multitudes, he went up into a mountain; and when he was set, his disciples came unto him. And he opened his mouth, and taught them, saying,—Blessed are the poor in spirit: for their's is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted. Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth. Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled. Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy. Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God. Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the Children of God. Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake: for their's is the kingdom of heaven.*

MEDITATION.

CHRIST openeth his discourse with *blessings*. But on whom are they pronounced? and whom hath he taught us to consider as the happiest of mankind? The *meek* and the *humble*, the *penitent* and the *merciful*, the *peaceful* and the *pure in heart*, those that hunger and thirst after *righteousness*, those that labour and faint not under *persecution*.—BLESSED JESUS! how different are thy maxims from those of the world! They call the proud, *happy*, and admire the gay, the rich, the powerful, and the victorious. But may I share in that *happiness*, which the SON OF GOD came to recommend and to procure! may I obtain *mercy* of the LORD; may I *see him*, and INHERIT HIS KINGDOM! And, while I am looking forward to an eternal weight of glory in another life, may I be content and happy in any station, in which it hath pleased GOD to place me. With such hope and with such enjoyment, will I perform my duty here, however mean or laborious; and endeavour, by meekness, by kindness, and purity of heart, to promote the glory of GOD and the welfare of my *neighbour* here, in the hope of eternal happiness hereafter.

(*To be continued.*)

For the Churchman's Magazine.

ELUCIDATION OF JOHN vi. 37.

All that the Father giveth me shall come unto me.

[Concluded from page 291.]

THE interpretation of this passage, by which it is made to maintain the doctrine of absolute predestination, is therefore not only inconsistent with the general benevolence of our Saviour's character, but with the particular object of his discourse. This object was the conviction of the Jews. Had our Saviour declared the doctrine of absolute predestination, so far from considering themselves as blameable, the Jews would have imputed their unbelief to their want of the means of grace, conferred on those only who were given to him.

On the contrary, he uniformly considers the unbelief of the Jews as a crime, and appears particularly anxious to convince them of it. John xv. 22. "If I had not come, and spoken unto them, they had not had sin: but now they have no *clack* for their sin;" and John v. 38. "Whom he (the Father) hath sent, him ye believe not," is the language of accusation. John v. 40. "Ye would not come unto me that ye might have life," is the moving address of expostulation. But what effect could these exhortations have on those who were taught that they were not chosen to eternal life? The following language would have been neither unreasonable nor censurable in them, "Lord, thou dost impute our unbelief to us as a crime; and yet thou dost declare that we are not given to thee by the Father. If we are not among those whom he hath chosen to eternal life, and the means of attaining it, how can we come unto thee?" In what an inconsistent light does this interpretation place the conduct and exhortations of our Saviour!—It may be said indeed, that the election of God does not interfere with perfect freedom of choice; that these unbelieving Jews, though not elected to salvation, were yet able to accept or reject the invitation of Christ. The consequence of this opinion is, that those very persons *might* attain *eternal life*, who were *not* among the number on *whom only* God had *decreed* to confer that blessing. If the meaning of our Saviour is that those only who

were elected, should come unto him, how was it possible for others to have the power to do so! If we maintain that they had, we subject the holy Jesus, who was the way, the *truth*, and the life, to the charge of sporting with the understanding of his hearers. His language was addressed to the unbelieving Jews. And was it possible for them (according to the interpretation we are now considering) to draw any other inference from it, than that as they were not elected to eternal life, they could not possibly attain it? Admitting that particular election and freedom of choice are reconcilable; was it consistent with the uniform sincerity and plainness of our Saviour, to deliver doctrines *apparently* so contradictory? Deceit was not in his mouth, simple truth always flowed from his lips. In speaking to an ignorant multitude, did it become him to deliver what must have been to them unintelligible? In reclaiming a deluded people, was it just in him to deliver a doctrine calculated to fix them in their error, and to enable them to use the plea, that the decree of God prevented their coming to him?

This interpretation then appears contradictory to the design of our Saviour's discourse. No rational construction of this passage can support the opinion, that any persons are "given" to Christ by an absolute decree, which has no respect to the use they would make of the means of grace. On the contrary, the whole tenor of our Saviour's discourse leads to the conclusion, that all those were given unto him, who would improve the means of grace, to their salvation; and all those were not given who rejected these means, to their everlasting condemnation. It was the object of Christ to convince the Jews, that prejudice and love of the world blinded their understandings. To these causes he attributes their unbelief, even when they saw his miracles. But, says he, "all whom the Father giveth me shall come unto me." As if he had said—All who unlike you obstinate and prejudiced Jews, possess that honest and upright mind which, through divine grace, leads them to judge candidly of my character, and of the proofs which I exhibit of my divine mission, are given unto me, and shall believe in me—the means of conviction are sufficient—they have the strongest motive to believe; for I offer them eternal life—and they have the power, because having improved their rational faculties, and the seeds

of divine grace in their hearts; they have received such further supplies of grace as enable them cordially to believe and obey me.

This latter interpretation is supported by those numerous passages where the causes of the unbelief of the Jews are assigned. This unbelief is never ascribed to any absolute decree of God. Christ imputes their unbelief to their *love of sin and hatred of the truth*. John iii. 19. "This is the condemnation, that light has come into the world, and men have chosen darkness rather than light, because their *deeds* are *evil*." John viii. 45. "Because I tell you the *truth*, ye believe me not." Their disregard to the word of God is another cause. John v. 38. "And ye have not this *word* abiding in you, for whom he hath sent, *him* ye believe not." Also John viii. 46. A third cause is, their being destitute of the love of God. John v. 42. "But I know that ye have not the *love of God* in you." A fourth cause assigned, is, their preferring the praise of men before the praise of God. John v. 44. "How can ye believe, who receive honour one of another, and seek not the honour that cometh from God." Their intractable and indocile dispositions are assigned as another cause. John x. 26. "But ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep, as I said unto you." And, lastly, their unbelief is ascribed to their perverseness and obstinacy. John viii. 43. "Why do you not understand my speech, even because ye cannot hear my words." These were the reasons why they would not come unto Christ. Those, therefore, whom God had given unto him must possess dispositions contrary to these. They must have a hatred for sin, a love of the truth, a regard for the revelations of God, a love of God, a desire after his favour, and humble docile dispositions. When Christ declares to the Jews, "all that the Father giveth me shall come unto me," his meaning must be, all that possess qualifications opposite to those which you possess, shall come unto me. The Jews could easily have comprehended the meaning of Christ in this address to them, because it was pointed at the causes of their unbelief; which causes they could find out without difficulty. That they did not understand his language as some now do, is surely evident from their not making that reply which would have been natural, had our Saviour declared that they were cut off from the blessings of the Gospel by a decree of God. In

their love for their sins, conscience must have pointed out to them the cause of their unbelief. The declaration of our Saviour therefore could not have been misunderstood. They had slighted the means of grace and knowledge; they had blinded their eyes and hardened their hearts, therefore God had not *given* them to Christ; they were totally unqualified to be subjects of his kingdom. God dealt with them as with their forefathers. To the children of Israel the language of Moses was, Deut. xxix. 2, 3, 4. "Ye have seen all that the Lord did before your eyes in the land of Egypt, unto Pharaoh, and unto all his servants, and unto all his land; the great temptations which thine eyes have seen, the signs and those great miracles; yet the Lord hath not given you an heart to perceive, and eyes to see, and ears to hear unto this day." Here it is imputed to the Israelites as a crime that the Lord had not given them an heart to perceive, and eyes to see, and ears to hear. Why? evidently because they had not improved the means of conviction in the miracles, the signs and the wonders wrought before their eyes. So, in the time of our Saviour, God did not give unto him the unbelieving Jews, because they hardened their hearts against that conviction, which the miracles of our Saviour were calculated to excite.

Our Saviour, in using the words, "all that the Father giveth me," designed to teach his hearers, that every thing good in them came from God. Those persons who possessed qualifications which made them fit disciples of Christ, and disposed them to believe in him, might with singular propriety be said to be *given* by God. By his preventing grace, *he* wrought those dispositions in their hearts; *he* disposed them like *sheep*, meek and docile, to hear the voice of Christ, the great Shepherd of souls; *he* gave them that "honest and good heart, which disposed them to hear the word, to keep it, and to bring forth fruit with patience." If it be asked, why did he not work the same dispositions in the hearts of the unbelieving Jews?—the answer is found in the oracles of truth—they "resisted his grace and did despite to his Spirit."

It may be objected that this interpretation makes the determinations of God posterior to and dependent on the will of the creature. And what is there in this either irrational or unscriptural? In Scripture man is every where considered as a free

agent. God deals with him according to the use which he makes of his rational faculties. All the blessings of the Gospel are conferred on those only who possess certain qualifications. We are told that the special communications of the Spirit of God are given to those only who "ask"—who "seek"—who "knock." Here the determination of God to grant a particular blessing is made to depend on the qualifications of the recipients. As well might we assert, contrary to this express declaration, that God bestows his Spirit before man asks, or seeks for it, as to oppose the interpretation of the text, because it makes the determinations of God posterior to the actions of men.

To the interpretation given of the passage, it may also be objected, that it takes from God the glory of man's salvation. But how is the glory of God advanced by the salvation of those whom by an absolute decree, he *brings* to everlasting life? How is the glory of God advanced in the eternal perdition of those who are *passed by*, and permitted, without having the means of grace, to perish in their sins? We cannot separate the glory of God from his goodness and justice. His glory is principally advanced by the *voluntary* service of free agents. How do the deniers of absolute decrees take from the glory of God? Do they make man his own Saviour? Do they assert that he has satisfied the claims of divine justice, and purchased the Holy Spirit, the principle of spiritual life? No; they say that all these blessings are the gift of God through Christ. They maintain, that without God man can do no good thing; that after he has done all, he is an unprofitable servant, and must receive eternal life as the free gift of unmerited mercy. But they maintain that the blessings of the Gospel are purchased by Christ for all mankind—that all have it in their power to come unto him and receive life—and that the wilful neglect of this great salvation will be the awful condemnation of the finally impenitent.

This passage then gives no support to the doctrine of absolute predestination.

It is undoubtedly true that there is an election often spoken of in Scripture. But it refers to the certainty of God's everlasting purposes of mercy to mankind through Christ Jesus. By the elect we may sometimes understand those who, perse-

vering in the faith unto the end, become heirs of everlasting life. But the term elect is applied in Scripture, and particularly by St. Paul in his Epistles, to the great body of Christians, both Jews and Gentiles, who are *called* and *elected* by baptism to the privileges of the Christian covenant. And that this election is not absolute, is evident from those who are the subjects of it being directed to “make their calling and election *sure*,” by which is meant not an *inward assurance* of salvation, but an actual securing of it, by “giving all diligence,” to “add to their faith, virtue; and to virtue, knowledge; and to knowledge, temperance; and to temperance, patience; and to patience, godliness; and to godliness, brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness, charity.” 2 *Pet.* i. 5, &c.

*Thoughts on various Subjects, and from various Authors. By
Bishop Horne.*

(Continued from page 305.)

CHARACTERS AND ACTIONS OF REMARKABLE PERSONS.

1. **I**T will be hereafter with a wicked man, when he is punished for his sins, as it was with Apollodorus, when he dreamed that he was flayed and boiled by the Scythians, and his *heart* spoke to him out of the caldron: “*Εγώ σοι τέρτω αἰτίαι.*”—“I am the cause of these thy sufferings.”

2. Lysimachus, for extreme thirst, offered his kingdom to the Getæ, to quench it. His exclamation, when he had drank, is wonderfully striking—“Ah! wretched me! who, for such a momentary gratification, have lost so great a kingdom! *Φεῖσθαι εἴη τὸν κακίανος, οὐδὲ δὲ νότον στῶ βασιλέων βασιλείας τῆς μακροχρονίας.*” How applicable is this to the case of him, who, for the *momentary* pleasures of sin, parts with the *kingdom* of heaven!

3. Horticulture, as it was the primitive employment of man, so it is what great geniuses, after having passed through the busiest scenes in the political and military world, retire to with pleasure towards the close of their days.—See Sir W. Temple’s Gardens of Epicurus.

4. I am ashamed to think, that a little business and few cares should indispose and hinder me in my religious exercises, when I read, that Frederic, king of Prussia, at a time when all his enemies were upon him, and his affairs seemed absolutely desperate, found leisure to write a kind of philosophical testament in French verse. See *Age of Louis XV.* ii. 213.

5. Cyrus had taken the wife of Tigranes, and asked him what he would give to save her from servitude? He replied, All that he had in the world, and his own life into the bargain. Cyrus, upon this, very generously restored her, and pardoned what had passed. All were full of his praises upon this occasion; some commending the accomplishments of his mind, others those of his person. Tigranes asked his wife, whether she did not greatly admire him? "I never looked at him," said she. "Not look at him!" returned he; upon whom then did you look?" "Upon him," replied she, "who offered his own life to redeem me from slavery."—This charming example should be copied into our behaviour in the house of God; where we should behold and contemplate the beauties and perfections of that blessed person alone, who actually did give his life a ransom for us.—See *Xenoph. Cyropæd.* iii. 147.

6. When Constantine was instigated by his courtiers to make examples of the Arians, who had insulted his statues, he silenced them by raising his hand to his face, and saying, "For mine own part, I do not feel myself hurt."

7. Would you see human vanity and misery at the highest? Behold the globe of the world carried in procession before the corpse of the Emperor Charles VII. who, during the short course of his wretched reign, could not keep possession of one small unfortunate province.

8. Victor Amadeus, tired of business and of himself, capriciously abdicating his crown, and a year afterwards as capriciously repenting, and desiring to have it again, displayed fully the weakness of human nature, and how difficult it is to gratify the heart, either with or without a throne.

9. Claude Lorrain studied his art in the open fields, where he frequently continued from the rising to the setting sun. He sketched whatever he thought beautiful and striking, and marked, in similar colours, every curious tinge of light on all kinds of objects. These were afterwards improved into land-

scapes, universally allowed to be superior to those of all other artists who have painted in the same style. In like manner Shakspeare and Ben Jonson travelled and associated with all sorts of people, to mark different *traits* in the characters and tempers of mankind, which were afterwards worked up into their inimitable plays. Every writer should follow these examples, and take down thoughts as they occur in reading or conversing, to be ready for use afterwards, when he sits down to compose.

10. To the hasty correctors of the *sacred* text may be applied what an ingenious author has observed, when speaking of the critics on *classical* writers—"The learning of the ancients had been long ago obliterated, had every man thought himself at liberty to corrupt the lines which he did not understand." Adventurer, vol. ii. p. 189. No. 58.

11. Obscurity of expression is elegantly called, by Mrs. Montague, "that *mist* common to the *eve* and *morn* of literature, which in fact proves it is not at its high meridian." See Essay on Shakspeare, p. 286.

12. The morning after the massacre of Paris, when the streets were covered with the bodies of slaughtered men, women, and children, before they were thrown into the Seine, the Catholics bethought themselves of a *charitable* device, which was, to strip them naked, in order to distribute their bloody clothes *to the poor*!—Saint Foix, Histoire de l'Ordre du S. Esprit.

13. To the soul confined in this material world, but aspiring to another and a better, apply the following lines:

_____Pent in his cage
Th' imprison'd eagle sits, and beats his bars;
His eye is rais'd to heav'n. Tho' many a moon
Has seen him pine in sad captivity—

_____still he thirsts to dip
His daring pinions in the fount of light.

Poetical Epistle to Austerity, on the English Poets.

14. In treating of the human mind, and the management of it, the two great sources of illustration are *agriculture* and *medicine*.—Bacon's Advancement of Learning, vii. 3.—Our Saviour therefore so frequently applied to them (as the prophets had done before) for the illustration of his doctrine.

15. When the Mexican Emperor Gatomozin was put upon the rack by the soldiers of Cortes, one of his nobles, who lay in tortures at the same time, complained piteously to his sovereign of the pain he endured. "Do you think," said Gatomozin, "that I lie upon roses?" The nobleman ceased moaning, and expired in silence.—When a Christian thinks his sufferings for sin, in sickness, pain, &c. intolerable, let him remember those of *his* Lord, endured patiently on that bed of sorrow, the cross, and he will think so no longer.

16. When Gatomozin, just taken, was brought into the presence of Cortes, he (Cortes) gave strict orders that the Mexican noblemen taken with the Emperor should be secured and strictly looked to, lest they should escape. "Your care, said Gatomozin, is needless; they will not fly; they are come to die at the feet of their sovereign!"—Such should be the disposition and resolution of the disciples and soldiers of Christ.

17. Bishop Andrews, when a lad at the University, used every year to visit his friends in London, and to stay a month with them. During that month, he constantly made it a rule to learn, by the help of a master, some language, or art, to which he was before a stranger. No time was lost.

18. When the same eminent person first became Bishop of Winton, a distant relation, a blacksmith, applied to him to be *made a gentleman*, i. e. to be ordained, and provided with a good benefice. No, said the Bishop, you shall have the best *forge* in the county; but—*every man in his own order and station*.

19. It was a good rule of Dr. Hammond's always to have a subject in hand; in which case he observed, that, whatever course of reading he happened to be in, he never failed of meeting with something to his purpose. For this reason, no sooner had he finished one sermon, or tract, but he immediately put another upon the stocks. Thus he was never idle, and all his studies turned to present account. He never walked out alone without a book, and one always lay open in his chamber, from which his servant read while he dressed or undressed himself. His *Life by Fell*, though written in a style far from clear and agreeable, is one of the most improving books I ever read.

20. Grove, the Presbyterian, published in 1728, a funeral

sermon on the Fear of Death. The subject was treated in so masterly a manner, that a person of considerable rank in the learned world declared, that, after reading it, he could have laid down and died, with as much readiness and satisfaction, as he had ever done any thing in his life.—Biog. Dict. art. *Grove*.—The sermon must have been a good one to have wrought such a persuasion: but how the persuasion would have kept its ground, had the person been taken at his word, and ordered to prepare for instant death, is another question.

21. Remarkable is the following passage of Josephus, relative to the wickedness of his countrymen before Jerusalem was besieged by the Romans—"That time abounded with all manner of iniquity, so that none was left undone. Yea, though one endeavoured to invent some new villany, yet could he invent none that was not then practised."

CHARITY.

1. In the world, no man liveth or worketh for himself alone; but every tradesman, mechanic, husbandman, &c. contributeth his labour and his skill towards supplying the different exigencies of the public, and rendering society comfortable. So ought it to be among Christians in the Church, which is a body composed of many members, and requireth that each member should perform its proper office for the benefit of the whole.

2. It is not easy to conceive, how much sin and scandal is occasioned by a severe quarrelsome temper in the disciples of Christ. It stirs up the corruptions of those with whom they contend; and leads others to think meanly of a profession which has so little efficacy to soften and sweeten the tempers of those who maintain it.—Doddridge, Fam. Expos. ii. 186.

3. An Abbé, remarkable for his parsimony, happened to be in company where a charitable subscription was going round. The plate was brought to him, and he contributed his louis-d'or. The collector, not observing it, came to him a second time. *I have put in*, said he. *If you say so, I will believe you*, returned the collector, *though I did not see it*.—*I did see it*, cried old Fontenelle, who was present, *but did not believe it*.

4. There are many deceptions concerning charity. 1. It may be practised on false motives; interest, custom, fear, shame, vanity, popularity, &c. 2. It is a mistake to imagine

it will atone for a want of other virtues, or for a life of vice and dissipation.—See Dupré, *Serm.* iii. *Crit. Review*, April 1782, p. 260.—Mr. Law's character of *Negotius*. Voltaire says, "the effect is the same, whatever be the motive." But surely the worth of every action must be estimated by the motive on which it is performed. He who attends me when I am sick, with a view to the making of my will, and getting my estate, is a very different man from him who does it only because he loves me. Yet the effect may be the same: I may be equally taken care of in either case. We are to be judged by one who knows the thoughts of our hearts, and will judge us accordingly. Charity made consistent with vice—Brown's *Sermons*, 278.—See Charity well described under the idea of generosity, Fitzosborne's *Letters*, 123.

(To be continued.)

[We invite the attention of our readers to the following treatise. It relates to some religious topics that are frequently, and with interest, discussed among Christians. Mr. Knox, the author, was a Presbyterian minister, and resided for several years in this country, but afterwards removed to the West-Indies, and died on the island of St. Croix. In the following republication of his letter, the introduction, and some other sentences are omitted which were not essential to the argument; and a note to the introduction is incorporated with the letter.]

A Letter to the Rev. Mr. JACOB GREEN, of New-Jersey, pointing out some Difficulties in the Calvinistic Scheme of Divinity, respecting FREE WILL, DIVINE DECREES, PARTICULAR REDEMPTION, &c. and requesting a Solution of them. By HUGH KNOX, Minister of the Gospel in the Island of Saba, in the West-Indies.

REV. AND DEAR SIR,

YOUR very kind letter came safe to hand some weeks ago, with your printed sermon on "The sinner's faultiness and spiritual inability;" for both of which I thank you.*****

I intirely approve of, and cordially adhere to, that scheme

of religion which tends to *exalt* God and *humble* the creature. I think GOD can never be exalted high enough in the thoughts of the creature, nor the sinful creature sunk low enough in his own thoughts: And if I could imagine that there was any one article in my creed which favoured the opposite, false, abominable doctrine, I would tear it off with indignation, and tear away that part of my heart which had harboured it. Yet I deem *sovereignty* in GOD to be an *amiable*, *qualified* perfection; and I dread to conceive of the ALMIGHTY as a *proud*, *partial*, *capricious* tyrant, in order to vindicate his independency on the creature, or under a pretence of doing this. And yet I cannot help thinking, as my mind is now circumstanced, that the Calvinistic doctrines of *particular redemption*, and *absolute*, *unconditional reprobation*, tend to excite this idea of the ever-blessed God!

I am so far of *Bolingbroke's* and his friend *Pope's* opinion, as to believe in a *qualified* sense of the phrase, that *whatever* is, is *right*, i. e. just as GOD *foresew*, *determined* and *permitted* that it should be; and that, of all possible plans of a world, he adopted *one of the best* upon the whole. This seems clearly deducible from the infinite power, wisdom and goodness of GOD. Though I greatly hesitate at that supposition of yours, "that GOD might have made a world of free agents, without a possibility of their falling into sin." I look on this as implying an absurdity. The contrary opinion, besides its evidence from reason, clears up or relieves many difficulties in our way of conceiving of the divine procedures. Whereas, on the other hand, if such an universe could have been made, it will be *hard*, if not *impossible*, for such creatures as we are, to conceive why it should not have been *best*.

Our reasonings on the necessity of introducing *sin* and *misery* into the system, in order to display the divine perfections, I conceive are at best very *arbitrary* and *hypothetical*; and it seems to give little advantage to our idea of the *divine benevolence*, to suppose it illustrated by the endless and inconceivable torments of millions of rational creatures, on the supposition that this *could* have been prevented by a *happy* and *sinless* system. It would be daring, I think, to say, that GOD had no other way of manifesting the glory of his perfections to his creatures, than by the eternal misery of a great number of them. Wherefore I conceive it safest to suppose (with all reverence

be it spoken) that GOD *could not* (in consistence with his perfections, and the free agency of the creature) make a system of *free ACCOUNTABLE* creatures, without the *possibility* of sin's entering into such a system.* As to the *quantum* of sin in our system, it was doubtless *foreseen, permitted*, and is wisely *overruled* by GOD: But I confess I am by no means pleased with your way of wording this, viz. "GOD's *willing, ordering*, and, in his way, *CAUSING* this quantum of sin; and this too, as a *necessary* and glorious display of his *holiness*." "CAUSING OF SIN, in the most *qualified sense*, seems a very harsh phrase, when applied to the GOD of *holiness*, and more especially as a *display of his holiness*?" I am still more at a loss to conceive how "GOD's having ordered *less sin* in our system, would have proved him to have been, not a *good* and *holy*, but an *envious* being!"

You have, indeed, in your last letter, in some measure, retracted these phrases, as *sounding harsh*; though you still seem to suppose they express an *important truth*. This, *my dear Sir*, does but the more confirm me in the suspicion, that a scheme of thinking, which requires *such language* to express it *roundly and clearly*, may be a little dangerous—and does the more attach me to the supposition advanced above; "that GOD *could not* (in consistency with the liberty of the creature) prevent sin's entering into the system; but that, having *permitted* it, upon a clear foresight of all its consequences, as best upon the whole, rather than not to produce such a system, he is determined to *overrule* it in such a manner, as will give a bright and perpetual display of his infinite power, wisdom, and goodness."

Were I thoroughly and convictively of your sentiments on this head, I readily allow that I could not possibly stumble at any doctrine of the *precuruses* or *CONCURSES* of the *Calvinists*.

* In your last letter you seem to triumph a little prematurely on what I here advance, and ask if this is consistent with a system which tends to *exalt* GOD, and *humble the creature*? I humbly conceive that it is, *Sir*. I never meant to say, nor can I think my words imply it, That GOD *could not* have prevented sin's entering, if he had so pleased: but this would be to destroy that *freedom* which I intended to maintain, by *confirming* such creatures in holiness. Surely you make some difference between *Adam's* liberty in a state of innocence, and that of *Abimelech* or any other sinner in the present state, where there is a dispensation of preventing restraining grace! Indeed I cannot reconcile the system of the *greatest benevolence* to any other plan, than the supposition of *such an impossibility*.

But then, according to my present way of conceiving of these matters, I should have insuperable difficulties about the doctrines of a judgment to come, and a future state of rewards and punishments : Not being able to reconcile God's *causing of sin*, in any sense of the word, with his rectoral justice in judging, condemning, and eternally punishing the sinner. And hence I should be strongly inclined to fall in with a modern Scotch philosopher, who, in his "inquiry into the foundation and principles of morals," espouses the doctrine of *fate*; and, as a consequence of this, holds all our moral feelings to be *deceitful*, and makes sin an *impossibility*.

This, notwithstanding, I well know; that the gentlemen who hold these sentiments, disavow all such consequences, and doubtless, see reason, to believe as they do. While I am charitably and firmly persuaded of this, and am far from a certainty on which side the truth lies, I earnestly pray that God may so enlighten, enlarge and sanctify my understanding, and direct my inquiries, as that I may be led into *all important and necessary* truth. Sure I am it would be highly criminal in me to embrace such a doctrine, while I continue to view it as inseparably connected with such dreadful consequences; as such a belief, in my present circumstances, must unavoidably excite in my mind a most *disagreeable* and *unworthy* idea of the Supreme Being. I can conceive of the *devil* as a most envious, malicious, revengeful spirit, replete with every malignant disposition, and wholly bent upon defacing the glory of the divine workmanship, and involving his more happy fellow-creatures in the same circumstances of guilt and misery with himself: But could I believe him endued with *creating power*, and making a world of rational immortal creatures, I know not whether my worst idea of him could induce me to believe him capable of *causing* these creatures of his to sin, and of punishing them for so doing, with eternal torments.

I am very far from believing that sin is a merely *fortuitous* thing in our system; or that it entered into it *beside* the knowledge, or *against* the will of the Creator. I firmly believe that God clearly foresaw and deliberately permitted it, in all its multiplied circumstances, aggravations and consequences; and that, in this view, it makes a *necessary* and *very important* part in the plan of our system. I believe also that it has by the

wonderfully wise superintendency of God, though directly contrary to its own accursed nature and tendency, been made to produce much glory to God, and superabundant good to many of his creatures. But farther I dare not say at present. I believe it to be, in some sort, a *necessary* and *unavoidable* evil in the system; a *fatal* evil to numbers of God's creatures; and that nothing but infinite wisdom and power could ever have extracted one single grain of good from it. And although I firmly believe that all those rational creatures who are, or shall be, destroyed by it, are wholly the *criminal causes* of their own destruction, yet I believe them to be so very *unfortunate* and *unhappy* at the same time, that, could any other plan have been fixed upon, whereby sin could have been totally excluded, and the free agency of the creature secured, infinite benevolence would have fixed upon such a plan, in preference to the present, or any other where sin must have been admitted. And in perfect consistence with this idea of the *divine benevolence*, I think I can conceive how God might *deliberately permit* sin to enter into our system rather than not form such a system; and punish impenitent sinners without having any real complacency in their misery; so that even the most miserable of *all* his creatures shall never have just reason to impeach the equity of his procedures. I can conceive that, notwithstanding this permission, God need be in no wise the cause of that sin which he is determined to punish with eternal torment in his creatures; but that sin is wholly the *creature of men and devils*; and that the misery they shall suffer, is the just and proportionate reward of their own evil devices: And, finally, that whosoever of our guilty, obnoxious race is saved, he shall be obliged to ascribe his salvation wholly to the *rich, free and undeserved* mercy of God in CHRIST.

In my present way of thinking, I have not the least doubt of the eternity of hell's torments. Not to mention the precision of Scripture in this article, I conceive it infinitely equitable that those who have an eternal weight of glory set before them, and put within their reach, by the Gospel, should suffer eternally for despising and rejecting it. So that, on principles of reason, I think I can justify the equity of the eternal punishment of Gospel despisers, at least. But were I to adopt the scheme of *universal benevolence*, upon your principles, and in the extent in

which you seem to hold it, I think it would stagger me a little in the belief of that doctrine. If, by the principle of *universal benevolence*, you mean, "A disposition to promote the greatest good of the whole system, as far as the plan of the system will admit;" I readily grant that the misery of a great number of the creatures, may consist with the principle of *universal benevolence*, in the Creator; and in this sense, I subscribe to the doctrine. But if you mean that GOD, having it in his power to plan a system wherein sin and misery could not take place, was pleased, in preference, to adopt the present, and deliberately to *cause and introduce* a certain *quantum* of sin and misery for the *greater good* of the whole; I profess I cannot see how such a choice and preference can consist with the principle of *universal benevolence*—unless the effects of this benevolence be supposed to reach, one time or other, to *every individual* of such a system, and give unto *every such individual* a surplussage of happiness in the whole period of its existence; and this would lead me unavoidably into the scheme of *Ramsey* and the other *universal redemptionists*. For I think, on this scheme of universal benevolence, no single individual of the whole system should be left in a state of endless misery, *merely to promote and advance the stability and happiness of some other individuals*. Wherefore I really think it behoved President Edwards, in a very particular manner, to confute *Ramsey's* scheme; and I shall gladly purchase his book when it appears. I know of but one way of getting rid of this difficulty, and that is, by supposing that, although GOD could have made a sinless system of free agents in the sense above, yet in no other system than the present, could he have given so bright a display and manifestation of his perfections to his creatures; and that for this reason he preferred and adopted the present, though necessarily involving multitudes of his creatures in endless misery. But this, as I observed above, is a mere *begging of the question*; seeing it is *daring* in us to limit the divine wisdom, and *impossible* for us to know that GOD could not have given as bright a display of his perfections to the creatures of a system, into which sin and misery could not have entered: besides; not the *essential glory*, but the *universal benevolence* of GOD, is the idea to be reconciled with his preference of the present plan. GOD, according to my idea of him, is not a *selfish being*, who either

needs or desires to have any of his perfections manifested at the expense of his creatures. His chief *declarative glory* consists in the exhibition of his *wisdom, holiness, justice, goodness, and mercy*; and without an evident display of these, he could not appear glorious to the apprehensions of his rational creatures. But to suppose him *preferring* a system *replete with sin*, and with the *endless misery* of numbers of his creatures, merely to illustrate two or three of his perfections, when he might have planned a system, consistent with the free agency of his creatures, from which sin and misery might have been precluded, seems utterly repugnant to the above amiable idea of the Almighty, and particularly inconsistent with his *universal benevolence*.

I really believe if any man were able to make this scheme *consistent with itself*, or to *cast light* on these *dark and deep things* of GOD, Mr. Edwards was that man. He was unquestionably an holy man, and he seems to have been all *penetration and intellect*; and it well becomes a person so every way inferior as I am, to controvert the sentiments of so *great and good* a man, with the utmost modesty and deference. But I confess his *doctrine of the will* seems to me little else than a *doctrine of fate*. The constant dependence of our choice upon motives *external or without us*; the uncontrollable power of these motives to produce our choice; and all these motives so *fixed and planted* by divine determination and providence, as that the chain can never be broken, but must infallibly draw with it the last link, render men's actions *so necessary*, that, in my opinion, there can be little room for *virtue or vice, for reward or punishment*. The creature does, indeed, in one sense, choose *very freely*; and yet, in another sense, he chooses *fatally*, and *cannot but choose*.* Yet, towards the latter end of this book,

* "That mind is said to be possessed of *natural liberty*, or *liberty of choice*, which is so constituted, as that its volitions shall not be *invincibly* determined, by any *foreign cause* or consideration whatever offered to it, but by its own sovereign pleasure.

"If any instance occurs in which the mind can choose *no otherwise than it does*, it is not in that instance *naturally free*; though it chooses with the *greatest delight*, and executes its volitions *without any restraint*.

"A man is said to be *morally free* when there is no interposition of the will of a superior being, to *prohibit or determine* his actions in any particular under consideration.

"What some call a *liberty of spontaneity*, consists merely in *choosing to per-*

he, very dexterously, gives all these volitions and actions of the creature such a *moral colouring*, as to make them the proper objects of *praise and blame, reward and punishment*. Now, if the will of a man has no *elective, self-determining* power in the choice of objects, but is necessarily and unavoidably moved and determined by a train of external motives, so fixed and ordered in the plan of things, as never to fail in determining it; it matters not to me how *freely*, i. e. *spontaneously*, the man chooses or refuses the objects that present themselves to him—there is certainly *no possibility* of his choosing or refusing otherwise than he actually does; and I should think it as absurd to *praise or blame, to punish or reward* a man for being bound at a stake, as a man thus necessarily determined in all his volitions: and how to reconcile this with *moral and accountable freedom*, I am utterly at a loss.

President *Edwards* has indeed, in a very *logical and laboured* manner, endeavoured to establish the dependence of human choice and volition upon external motives, and to prove the absurdity and impossibility of the self-determining power of the will, and its inconsistency even with *common sense*, though it has been generally thought a dictate of this. And I confess I have neither leisure, nor perhaps penetration enough, to discover where the fallacy lies in his reasoning. But, while to me even greater absurdities and impossibilities seem to follow from his scheme, than from that of the self-determining power, I must needs suppose some fallacy in his reasoning, and can never adopt a scheme, which, as I conceive of it upon present evidence, intirely destroys *moral agency*. The case is this: You and President *Edwards* seem to me to hold a scheme, wherein all things are so *fixed, ordered and disposed* by a divine predetermination and decree, that, by a *necessity of consequence*, they *must* come to pass—nay, what is much more, that there is a proper *efficiency and causality* on the part of God, in determining the volitions and actions of mankind, even those that are evil: for what less can be meant by God's laying a train of motives before these agents, which, as so many *necessary causes*,

form any particular action. Nor does it at all enter into the question, whether we can choose or perform the contrary. But since this is nothing more than *willing*, it does not deserve the name of *liberty*." Vide Dr. *Dodridge's* posth. Lect. ed. 1st. p. 34, 35, 36.

must infallibly produce their effects, and bring these volitions and actions into existence. This scheme you seem to think *necessary* in order to maintain the *supremacy* and *sovereignty* of God and the absolute dependence of the creature, and essential to the plan of the divine superintendency and government. And in order to support this scheme, you produce a number of plausible passages of Scripture which seem to countenance it; such as "the certain predisposal and predetermination of the sufferings and death of CHRIST, and the blameableness and guilt of the agents who fulfilled this decree;—God's being said to harden *Pharaoh's* heart, and his guilt and punishment in acting in consequence of this supposed divine influence or appointment," and the like. Now the difficulty with me lies in reconciling this scheme with the *moral perfections* of God, and the *free agency* and accountableness of the creature. Could I do this clearly, I should have no objection to the scheme.

(*To be continued.*)

For the Churchman's Magazine.

The Desire of the Christian for the Joys of Heaven.

WHEN the pious king of Israel was banished, by a rebellious son, from his throne, and from the temple at Jerusalem where he had been accustomed, with the voice of joy and praise, to celebrate the loving-kindness of the Lord, and to rejoice in the display of the divine power and glory, he poured forth the bitter sighs of regret; and indulged the most lively desires, that he might again be permitted to worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness. "As the hart panteth after the water brook, so panteth my soul after thee, O God. My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God: *when shall I come and appear before God?*"

Ardent also is the desire with which the soul of the pious Christian pants for his eternal home, for the fruition of the joys of God's presence. An exile from the heavenly Jerusalem, he is doomed to encounter pain and sorrow in this valley of tears, while his fainting spirits are refreshed with only occasional beams of glory from the celestial Zion. Panting for rest from

the toils and duties of his journey, and inspired with the foretaste of heavenly joys, he ardently desires the full fruition of these divine pleasures; he ardently implores a translation to the glories of the divine presence. "When shall I come and appear before God?"

This ardent desire of the pious Christian to be translated to the glories of the heavenly state, arises from the considerations that there he will be released from those sins and sorrows which alloy his enjoyments on earth; there he will attain the perfection of virtue; and there he will be blessed with the consummation of all his joys.

The sincere Christian ardently desires a translation to the glories of the heavenly state, because there he will be released from the sins and sorrows which alloy his enjoyments on earth.

The life of the Christian is a life of dangerous and toilsome warfare. He has to contend with powerful and implacable foes; with the sinful passions of his heart; with the alluring temptations of the world; and with the ensnaring wiles of the great adversary of his salvation. Constant solicitude, uniform and ardent vigilance, vigorous assiduity, and undaunted resolution, are the painful but necessary virtues which he must cherish. Engaged in a race in which rigorous self-denial and constant exertion are necessary to secure the prize for which he is contending, how ardently must he pant for the period of promised repose. Dangers and difficulties retard his progress; numerous sorrows and calamities cast over his mind the shades of despondency. Ardent and vigilant as he may be in the service of God; warm and vigorous as he may be in his conflicts with temptation, he is often humbled by defeat; and, in the midst of the most fervent aspirations after holiness, is obliged to lament the weakness of his exertions, the prevalence of sin in his heart, and the imperfection of his highest attainments. While difficulties and toils thus oppress his spirit, while sin and sorrow thus corrode his joys, must he not with holy desire anticipate the period when these conflicts shall cease, when these clouds of despondency shall be chased away? "When shall I come and appear before God?" When shall the blest period of repose arrive from the toils and sorrows of this wearisome pilgrimage? When shall the painful warfare that now distracts and oppresses me, be for ever closed? When shall the prize

of victory crown my laborious exertions in the toilsome race of life? When shall my spirit, harassed by temptation and calamity, be for ever at rest in the bosom of God? When shall I be translated from the darkness and gloom of this vale of tears, to enjoy the glories of heaven? When, O my soul, the period of thy exile closed, shalt thou be restored to the ineffable and undecaying joys of thy heavenly home? “When shall I come and appear before God?”

The desire of the sincere Christian after his heavenly inheritance also arises from the consideration that there he will attain the perfection of virtue.

The most ardent aspirations after virtue will ever animate the breast of the sincere Christian. To be pure as the fountain of purity is pure, to be holy as the God whom he loves and serves is holy, is the distinguishing, the uniform, and the supreme desire of his heart. To endeavour to “perfect holiness in the fear of the Lord,” he is excited by the strongest obligations and the most powerful motives. Holiness in heart and life is enjoined by the command of his supreme Law-giver and Judge; it is that object of infinite value for which the Redeemer shed his blood and bestows his grace; it is the only way of returning the immense debt of gratitude which the Christian owes to his God and Saviour; it is the only pledge of his enjoyments, and the only passport to eternal bliss. With what ardent desire then must the Christian seek perfection in virtue! To obtain the inestimable blessing of a pure and perfect heart, he will, with daily and persevering ardour, assail the throne of grace, and with undaunted and vigorous resolution contend against the assaults of temptation. But, alas! he often sinks under the mortification of disappointment and defeat. His attainments in virtue will fall far short of the ardour of his desires, and of the claims of the divine law. An infirm and corrupt heart, the solicitations of an alluring world, the cares and conflicts of a busy and active life—these are the enemies with which the Christian has to contend—these tarnish his attainments, and palsy his exertions in holiness and virtue. Complete redemption from sin—complete establishment in the graces and virtues of the divine Image, will not reward the desires and exertions of the Christian in this present imperfect state. They are the blissful fruits of an eternal existence; they are re-

served for that heavenly state where the soul will be wholly irradiated and transformed by the beams of divine glory.

To this divine and heavenly state, where the graces of the divine Image shall be for ever established in the soul, the Christian will eagerly look forward. "When shall I come and appear before God?" When shall the agonizing warfare with sin and temptation cease? When shall this rebellious heart yield no longer a reluctant obedience to thy gracious commands, O my God? When shall temptation cease to seduce it from thy service? When shall irregular passions cease to blast its purity and peace? Bent as my affections are on the service of my God, and ardently fixed on the attainment of that holiness which alone can make me the object of his love, still I have to regret the deficiencies, the falls, the irregularities that mark my course. When shall these inconsistencies cease, and my purified soul supremely delight in God the fountain of holiness and source of all its joys? The object of the unparalleled love of my divine Redeemer, bought with the price of his most precious blood, to him I would seek to consecrate my most ardent affections, the sacred devotion of my heart. Ah! when shall I be translated to that heavenly kingdom where I shall see the ineffable glories of my Saviour without a veil, and unincumbered by the infirmities and sins of a corrupt nature, soar to his throne in ceaseless and grateful adoration. "When shall I come and appear before God?"

(To be continued.)

For the Churchman's Magazine.

[The following letter was sent for insertion in the *Monthly Anthology*, published at Boston, shortly after the appearance of the review on which it animadverts. It has not appeared in that miscellany; and the Editor is therefore constrained, in justice to himself, and to what he conceives the cause of truth, to insert it in the *Churchman's Magazine*. The *Monthly Anthology* has given extensive currency to misrepresentations of Episcopal principles and to fallacious reasonings against them, which it is necessary to expose. The Editor has only to fear, that some of his readers will think too large a portion

of the present number devoted to a controverted subject; but he trusts the circumstance of his being unable to procure a place for this letter in the miscellany for which it was designed, will be accepted as an apology for its appearing in the present work.]

Letter to the Editor of the Monthly Anthology, containing Remarks on a Review of Dr. MILLER's Letters on the Constitution and Order of the Christian Ministry, which appeared in that Work.

MR. EDITOR,

WHEN any criticisms in a public miscellany represent writers and their opinions in an unfavourable light, the impartial love of justice, and a wish to promote the spirit of candid discussion, will lead the Editors of the work, promptly to admit animadversions which profess to correct error and to vindicate truth.

My confidence that these are the principles which guide the Editor of the Monthly Anthology, induces me to request his insertion of some remarks on a "Review of Dr. Miller's letters on the constitution and order of the Christian ministry," which appeared in that Miscellany for November last. The design of these remarks is not to introduce any matter that may involve you, Mr. Editor, in what you will probably deem the intricate and unpleasant mazes of ecclesiastical controversy. They aim merely at rendering an act of justice to writers and opinions whom your reviewer sometimes attempts to hold up to unmerited odium, and sometimes (doubtless unintentionally) most essentially misrepresents.

The order of the Christian ministry, so far from being, as your reviewer affects to consider it, a matter of indifference, involves an enquiry of the first importance. Who are those officers whom the divine Author of our religion, and the source of all power in his Church, commissioned to act in his name in the administration of sacred things—is surely an enquiry which merits the most serious consideration. Why then should the discussion of this important subject excite astonishment? Why should the writer who is desirous to awaken the attention of

Christians to a subject which involves nothing less than the means of *external* communion with the Church of their Redeemer, be accused of "an unnecessary and reprehensible violation of charity and peace?" Are not discordant opinions entertained by different sects of professing Christians on many fundamental points of doctrine and church order? Must they, by the avowal or defence of these opinions, incur the anathema of being "violators of charity and peace?" Then, Mr. Editor, professing Christians are reduced to the singular dilemma of being compelled either to avoid the avowal and defence of opinions which they conscientiously believe are true and important, or to bear the heavy odium of throwing the brands of discord through the peaceful walks of social life. The advocate of the Trinity must behold his Saviour stripped of divine honours, and yet forbear to "confess him before men," lest "charity and peace should be violated!" The Unitarian, on the other hand, must view one whom he considers a mere man exalted to divine honours; and yet forbear to arrest what he deems the work of impiety, lest he should *violate charity and peace!* The Calvinist must behold an attempt, as he conceives, to strip the ETERNAL of his irresistible sovereignty; and the Arminian, as he conceives, the dangerous design to exalt this sovereignty on the ruins of the bright attribute of mercy; and yet put their hands upon their mouths, lest they should *violate the law of charity and peace!* No attempt shall be made to defend those sacraments instituted by the Lord of life, which the Quaker rejects; or to claim the right of baptism for infants whom the Saviour blessed and embraced in his merciful arms, lest *charity and peace be violated!* The Episcopalian must cease to vindicate a ministry transmitted to him by his forefathers with the sacred seal of Apostolic and Primitive authority, must cease to warn his brethren of the danger of perishing in the "gainsaying of Korah;" and the anti-Episcopalian must forbear to expose pretensions which he conceives are unwarrantable and dangerous, lest *charity and peace be violated!* Away, Mr. Editor, with the absurd supposition. It would sacrifice truth not to charity, but to that spurious liberality, which would soon leave us no truth for which to contend. It would sacrifice Apostolic order to that criminal indifference which would soon leave the Church no officers, no usages but what popular caprice might

impose. Establish the position that free discussion, or, if you please, *controversy*, is never to be admitted, and the current of truth which when agitated flows pure and clear, will soon become corrupt and noxious. No, Mr. Editor, charity and peace need never be violated by zealously maintaining any of the adverse opinions which unhappily divide professing Christians. These discordant opinions are the unavoidable consequence of the imperfection and corruption of human nature. Their prevalence being predicted in the Gospel of Christ, so far from diminishing the credibility of this Gospel, is one proof of its divine origin. When in the view of the heresies and schisms that would deform and rend the body of Christ, inspired Apostles delivered the injunctions to "contend earnestly for the faith," and to avoid schism, as a "carnal" sin, they surely had no apprehensions that the sacred duties which they enjoined would be incompatible with that charity which is the "bond of perfectness." Charity and peace *may indeed be violated* in the *spirit* and the *manner* with which discussion is conducted. And these sacred virtues *are* violated, whenever accusations like those of your Reviewer are directed against any sect or individuals who only exercise the indubitable right of decently avowing and maintaining their opinions.

Your Reviewer asserts, that none "can be so *absurd* as to maintain at the present day, either the *jus divinum*, or the uninterrupted succession of any hierarchy on earth." Modest Mr. Reviewer! How deep the blush which must have suffused your countenance when you were forced to assume the magisterial chair, and doubtless with infinite reluctance to put a fool's cap on some of the most illustrious scholars and divines that "in the present day" have been the boast and ornament of the English Church; on the HORNES, the JONES, the HORSLEYS, the FABERS,* the DAUBENYS, the HUNTINGFORDS; of whom, some still grace the Lyceum and the Temple, while others have gone "to the resting-place of the spirits of the just." I leave the advocate of Presbytery to recount the distinguished names of those who, "under the covering of the Scotch bonnet," have advanced pretensions which the Reviewer is

* Author of a "Dissertation on the Prophecies," and of "The Apostolical Origin of Episcopacy."

pleased to brand as "absurd!" When he scowls at the idea of uninterrupted succession, he surely forgets that the blessed Founder of the Church declared to his Apostles, that "he would be with them to the end of the world;" he surely forgets the inspired declaration, that "no man taketh this honour (the honour of the priesthood) to himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron," by an *external commission*. Your Reviewer, Mr. Editor, will certainly not be the advocate of *miraculous* commissions in the present day. And how this external commission, declared by the voice of inspiration to be essential to the Christian ministry, can be derived but by uninterrupted succession from those originally vested with power to convey it, will puzzle even the Reviewer himself, with all his ingenuity, to point out. Will the Reviewer seriously maintain, that the *people* are the source of *spiritual* power? Will he avow that any set of *Laymen* can confer spiritual authority? Will he seriously maintain, that a commission conferred by them can be as valid as one received from the "laying on of the hands" of those who are regularly commissioned, in succession, by the great Head of the Church? Then the Church is no longer the "Church of God and his Christ," but the Church of the people. Then the ministry are no longer "stewards of God," but stewards of the people. Then Mr. Reviewer can in vain lay claim to be ranked among Episcopalians, Presbyterians, or even among well informed Congregationalists.* He will spurn the "encroachments" of the ministry whom these denominations maintain are authorized to act in Christ's name by a commission derived from him! Like the Independents and Brownists of the turbulent days that are past, he will shake off the shackles of the Bishop, the Presbytery, and the Council; and, enlisting in his service some lay *brethren*, "humble, private, and unassuming laicks," he will constitute, by lay ordination, ministers equal in authority to those whose "encroaching spirits" are not satisfied with any thing short of a divine commission, of being *called of God, as was Aaron!*

* The ingenious Dr. Lathrop, of Springfield, Massachusetts, in some sermons published a few years since, ably vindicates the doctrine of the necessity of a power derived by succession to constitute a valid ministry.

The Reviewer ought to know that in branding the exclusive claims of Episcopacy with the imputation of being "absurd, uncharitable, and encroaching," he casts odium not on a few Episcopalians, but on that venerable Church which has often been justly styled the bulwark of the Reformation. The Episcopal Church in England and America maintain, in the preface to her book of ordination, "that it is evident unto all men diligently reading *holy Scripture* and *ancient authors*, that from the *Apostles' times* there have been three orders of ministers in Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests and Deacons." She declares that she will receive none as ministers but "those who have had Episcopal consecration or ordination." In her solemn ordination prayers she devoutly thanks "Almighty God" that HE has, "by his divine Providence," and "by his Holy Spirit, instituted divers orders in his Church," and names "Bishops, Priests and Deacons" as the orders thus appointed. And when the Episcopalian is supported by these authorities from the public offices of his Church—offices drawn up and subscribed by "those venerable men who finally settled her government and worship"—is he to be sneeringly told by this Reviewer, that "the CRANMERS, and WAKES, and USHERS, and STILLINGFLEETS of the Church must look down with ineffable indignation on the folly of their pretended successors, who would alarm the unwary, the timid, or the ignorant in a country like this, with the *jus divinum* of Diocesan Episcopacy!" Prudence should have prevented Mr. Reviewer from writing thus dogmatically on points with which he does not appear to be fully acquainted. And the spirit of candour should have restrained the charges of "folly," of a base and unwarrantable design to "alarm the unwary, the timid, or the ignorant." The "indignation" which these charges are calculated to excite against those at whom they are aimed, is evidently merited by him who thus rashly urges them. If these authorities from the offices of ordination do not place Episcopacy on the footing of *divine institution*, language has no meaning. The Episcopalian, however, will not contend for words. Acknowledge the *Apostolic* institution of Episcopacy, and you satisfy him. He then inquires—If the Apostles, the divinely inspired Governors of the Church, constituted divers orders of ministers, and placed exclusively with one order the power of

ordination, who shall dare to change that ministry by which the visible Church is known? Who shall presume to substitute human powers in the place of that authority which flows from the only legitimate fountain, Christ and his Apostles, the head and founders of the Church? "The highest dignity of the American Church"* has too high a sense of propriety, and of his solemn obligations to the Church at whose altar he ministers, to relinquish any of her doctrines or institutions. He proposed indeed, at a period when he supposed *necessity* justified the measure, a departure from the regular succession of Bishops. At the same time he acknowledged the indispensable obligation to preserve it when it could be had. He maintained as *his own*, the Episcopal opinion, that "Jesus Christ and his Apostles commissioned an order of ministers superior to Presbyters, and vested them with the power of ordination, and that this *super eminent commission* has been *handed down* to the present day." The Reviewer, if he had read the pamphlet of the Bishop, or even the "Essays on Episcopacy," mentioned in his review, (and if he had not, he certainly was not qualified for stating facts and opinions on this subject,) must have known all these particulars. Why then in candour and justice did he not state them? The Reviewer, if he has read Hooker's Ecclesiastical Policy (and if he has not, he is not qualified for managing or reviewing any Episcopal controversy), must know that many to whom he sneeringly applies the obnoxious appellation of *High Church*, while they maintain the divine institution of Episcopacy, admit of a departure from it in cases of *necessity*. Why then does he represent such a concession as relinquishing the claims of Episcopacy to divine institution? Can the divine institution of Episcopacy be avowed in stronger terms than by Hooker, when he asserts that "Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons, such as are in the Church of England, had their beginning from Christ and his blessed Apostles themselves;"† that "it was the general received opinion of the ancient Christian world, that *ecclesia est in Episcopo*, the outward being of a church, consisted in the having of a Bishop;"‡ "that the first institution of Bishops was from Heaven, was even

* The Reviewer refers to Bishop White of Pennsylvania.

† Eccl. Pol. book v. sect. 78.

‡ Eccl. Pol. book vii. sect. 5.

of God; the Holy Ghost was the author of it.* And yet Hooker admits of a departure from Episcopacy in a case of "inevitable necessity." Bishop White will probably have no objection to consider himself an Episcopalian on the principles of Hooker: that Bishop White did not consider a *temporary departure* from Episcopacy in a case of necessity as incompatible with an acknowledgment of its general obligation, is ascertained from his explicit declarations in an appendix to a charge to his clergy. In this appendix (p. 56.) he states, "To those who being adverse to the *Apostolic origin* of Episcopacy, have considered him as having consented with them in opinion, he is ready to declare, on every suitable opportunity, that the *contrary* was intended to be implied, and that it is obvious according to his conceptions, on the face of the performance." This performance was the one in which the measure of a temporary departure from Episcopacy in a supposed case of necessity was proposed.

(*To be concluded in the next number.*)

DUTY OF RECEIVING THE HOLY EUCHARIST.

From a Sermon on the Eucharist, by the Rev. ADAM CLARK.

LET no man deceive his own soul, by imagining he can still have all the benefits of Christ's death, and yet have nothing to do with the sacraments. It is a command of the living God, founded on the same authority as, "Thou shalt do no murder;" none, therefore, can disobey it and be guiltless. Again: Let no man impose upon himself by the supposition, that he can enjoy this supper spiritually, without using what too many impiously call the carnal ordinance; i. e. without eating bread and drinking wine in remembrance of the death of Christ. Is not this a delusion? What says the sovereign will of God? *Do this.* What is *this*? Why, take bread, break and eat it; take the cup and drink ye all of it. This, and only this, is fulfilling the will of God. Therefore the eating of the sacrament

* Eccl. Pol. book vii. sect. 5.

tal bread, and the drinking of the consecrated wine, are essential to the religious performance of our Lord's command. It is true, a man may use these and not discern the Lord's body; not duly and deeply consider that these symbols point out the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which were offered up to God for him; i. e. he may, possibly, not keep the eye of his faith upon the atonement, while he is using the symbols, and thus the sacred ordinance be no more to him than a common thing; but does not he who rejects the symbols, put it absolutely out of his power to celebrate the divine ordinance? A man may rest in the letter and not attain the spirit. But can a man who has it in his power to avail himself of the letter and does not do it, consistently with the appointment of God, accept the spirit? The letter may be without the spirit, but can the spirit in this case be without the letter? In other words, is not obedience to the literal meaning of our Lord's words essential to the attainment of the spiritual blessings to which they refer? And is it not as absurd to expect spiritual blessings without the use of the appointed means, as to expect to hear sounds, and see objects, without the medium of the sun and atmosphere?

P O E T R Y.

THE FRIEND. *By Bishop HORNE.*

THE fastest friend the world affords
Is quickly from me gone;
Faithless behold him turn his back,
And leave me all alone!

“My friend, sincerely yours *till death*.”
The world no farther goes;
Perhaps, while *earth to earth* is laid,
A tear of pity flows.

Be thou, my *Saviour*, then, my *friend*,
In thee my soul shall trust,
Who false wilt never prove in death,
Nor leave me in the dust.

Home while my other friends return,
All solemn, silent, sad,
With thee my flesh shall rest in hope,
And all my bones be glad.

THE ASPIRATION.

By the Rev. JOHN NORRIS, Rector of Bemerton.

HOW long, great God, how long must I
Immured in this dark prison lie!
Where at the gates and avenues of sense
My soul must watch to have intelligence:
Where but faint gleams of thee salute my sight,
Like doubtful moon-shine in a cloudy night.
When shall I leave this magic sphere,
And be all mind, all eye, all ear!

How cold this clime! and yet my sense
Perceives even here thy influence.
Even here thy strong magnetic charms I feel,
And pant and tremble like the amorous steel.
To lower good, and beauties less divine,
Some times my heart erroneous does decline;
But yet (so strong the sympathy)
It turns, and points again to thee.

I long to see this excellence
Which at such distance strikes my sense.
My impatient soul struggles to disengage
Her wings from the confinement of her cage.
Would'st thou, great love, this prisoner once set free,
How would she hasten to be link'd to thee!
She'd for no angels' conduct stay,
But fly, and love on all the way.

THE MONKISH LATIN HYMN,

Used as a Grace after Meat, at Magdalen College, Oxford.

TE Deum patrem colimus,
Te laudibus prosequimur,
Qui corpus cibo reficis,
Celesti mentem gratiâ.

Te adoramus, O Jesu,
Te, Fili unigenite,
Te, qui non dedignatus es
Subire claustra virginis.

Actus in crucem factus es
Irato Deo victima ;
Per te, Salvator unice,
Vitæ spes nobis rediit.

Tibi, æterne Spiritus,
Cujus afflatu peperit
Infantem Deum Maria,
Æternum benedicimus.

Triune Deus, hominum
Salutis autor optime,
Immensum hoc mysterium
Ovanti lingua canimus.

PARAPHRASE. *By Bishop HORNE.*

THEE, mighty Father, we adore,
And praise thy name for evermore ;
Whose bounty feeds all Adam's race,
And cheers the hungry soul with grace.

Great co-eternal Son, to thee,
With one consent, we bow the knee;
For our salvation man become,
Thou didst not scorn the virgin's womb.

The Paschal Lamb, foreshown of old,
In thee, sweet Jesu! we behold,
And pardon through thy blood receive,
While on thy cross we look and live.

Thee too, all-hallow'd mystic Dove,
We ever bless, and ever love:
Thy wonders how shall we declare?
The Lord was born, the virgin bare!

Almighty everlasting Three,
No other God we have but thee;
Thy glorious works, immortal King,
In triumph thus we daily sing.

ECCLIESIASTICAL NEWS.

The following Account of a Canonization at Rome, taken from an English publication, will show that some of the most absurd Ceremonies of Popery are still practised.

ON Trinity Sunday, 1807, the Canonization of five blessed inhabitants of heaven took place, viz. Francis Caracciolo, Benedict de San Traledo, Angale Merעי, Colette Boilet, and Jacintha Marescotti. The Pope was met at the gate of the Church by the Chapter of the Vatican, and conducted to the altar, where the holy sacrament was exposed. He was then placed again in his chair, and carried into the grand theatre erected for this august ceremony. Here he ascended a magnificent throne, and received the homage of the Cardinals, &c. The Solicitor for the Canonization then advanced towards the throne, where the Advocate, kneeling, made his request for the Canonization of these five blessed Celestials. The Arch-

bishop of Carthage answered, in the name of his Holiness, that it was his intention first to implore the assistance of divine light, through the intercession of the Saints. The head of the church, and the whole of the assembly, then knelt, and the litanies of the Saints were sung. The Advocate then made a second request, and recourse was again had to fresh prayers. The request was repeated a third time in these words, "*Instante, Instantius, Instantissime.*"

The Archbishop answered, "His Holiness decides, that it is agreeable to God that the five blessed souls should be ranked among the Saints." The Pope then pronounced the decree of Canonization on the persons first mentioned. After which the Cardinal Solicitor kissed the hands and knees of the Holy Father, who began the *Te Deum*. Suddenly resounded the trumpets, the bells of the church, the discharge of field-pieces, and of the artillery of the castle of St. Angelo.

This signal being given, the bells of all the churches in Rome rent the air during a whole hour. Among several other ceremonies too tedious to recite, prayers were offered to the Saints which they had just made, and his Holiness delivered a learned discourse. The Cardinal Bishop then requested, and published a plenary indulgence for seven years, and seven times forty days, for those who had assisted on the occasion, and those who have visited the tombs of these new Saints!

✍ Several articles of ecclesiastical news are unavoidably postponed.

MARRIED,

At Norwalk, Connecticut, by the Rev. Mr. Whitlock, Mr. George Cannon, to Miss Betsey Hanford, of Wilton.

✍ In future no account of marriages and deaths will be inserted which is not forwarded for publication.

In the list of the Clergy annexed to the Journals of the General Convention, the names of the Rev. Dr. William Smith, residing in New-York, and of the Rev. Mr. Wheaton, of Stamford, Connecticut, were inadvertently omitted.

We are desirous to correct the following errors in the Pastoral Letter from the House of Bishops: Page 18, line 20, for "these" read *those*, and page 21, line 14, for "softens" read *fosters*.